

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

---

HUNTERS POINT SHIPYARD  
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD

---

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF MEETING

January 23, 2003

Dago Mary's Restaurant  
Donahue Street @ Hudson Street  
Hunters Point Shipyard, Building 916  
San Francisco, California

Reported by Christine M. Niccoli, RPR, C.S.R. No. 4569

===== \*\*\*\*\* =====

NICCOLI REPORTING

619 Pilgrim Drive

Foster City, CA 94404-1707

(650) 573-9339

CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTERS SERVING THE BAY AREA

1 P A R T I C I P A N T S

2

3 FACILITATOR: MARSHA PENDERGRASS - Pendergrass &

4 Associates

5 CO-CHAIRS: KEITH FORMAN - United States Navy SWDIV

6 LYNNE BROWN - Communities for a Better

7 Environment (CBE), Community First

8 Coalition (CFC)

9

10 RAB MEMBERS

11

12 LANI ASHER - Communities for a Better Environment (CBE),

13 Community First Coalition (CFC)

14 AMY BROWNELL - San Francisco Department of Public Health

15 BARBARA BUSHNELL - ROSES, resident

16 MAURICE CAMPBELL - Business Development, Inc. (BDI);

17 Community First Coalition (CFC); New California Media;

18 NEW BAYVIEW NEWSPAPER

19 CHARLES L. DACUS, SR. - Hunters Point resident, ROSES

20 MARIE J. FRANKLIN - Shoreview Environmental, Incorporated

21 CHEIN KAO - California Dept. of Toxic Substances Control

22 JACQUELINE ANN LANE - US Environmental Protection Agency

23 KEVYN D. LUTTON - Resident

24 JESSE MASON - Bayview-Hunters Point Community Advocates,

25 Community First Coalition (CFC), Economic Subcommittee

1 RAB MEMBERS [Cont.]  
2  
3 JULIE MENACK - Regional Water Quality Control Board  
4 JAMES MORRISON - Environmental Technology  
5 GEORGIA OLIVA - Communities for a Better Environment  
6 (CBE), CCA member  
7 SULULAGI PALEGA - Hunters Point Boys & Girls Club,  
8 Housing Authority, Samoan Community Development Center  
9 DOROTHY PETERSON - Shoreview Resident Association  
10 KAREN G. PIERCE - Bayview Advocates, BVHP Democratic Club  
11 MELITA RINES - India Basin Neighborhood Association  
12 AHIMSA PORTER SUMCHAI - Bayview-Hunters Point  
13 Health & Environmental Resource Center (HERC)  
14 Radiological Subcommittee  
15 KEITH TISDELL - Hunters Point resident, Membership &  
16 Bylaws Subcommittee  
17 RAYMOND TOMPKINS - Bayview-Hunters Point Coalition on  
18 Environment  
19 CAROLINE WASHINGTON - Southeast Community College Advisory  
20 Board, Network for Elders  
21 MICHAEL WORK - US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)  
22 ---oOo---  
23  
24

1 OTHER ATTENDEES  
2  
3 ARVIND ACHARYA - Innovative Technical Solutions, Inc.  
4 (I.T.S.I.)  
5 HARRY ADAMS - Observer  
6 JAMES ARLINGTON ANSBRO - Resident  
7 RAJIV BHATIA, M.D. - San Francisco Department of Public  
8 Health (guest speaker)  
9 DOUG BIELSKIS - Tetra Tech EM Inc.  
10 ANDREW L. BOZEMAN - Heaven's Glade  
11 MIKE BURKARD - Denbeste Transportation Inc.  
12 A. DON CAPOBRES - San Francisco Redevelopment Agency  
13 FRANCISCO DA COSTA - Environmental Justice Advocacy  
14 DOUGLAS DAVENPORT - Tetra Tech EM Inc.  
15 DARYL DeLONG - New World Technology  
16 DAVID B. DeMARS - United States Navy  
17 HERALDO FRAUSTO - Resident  
18 BILL HANEY - New World Technology  
19 BOB HOCKER - Lennar/Bayview-Hunters Point Team  
20 CAROLYN HUNTER - Tetra Tech EM Inc.  
21 PAULA KANESHIRO  
22 RONALD W. KEICHLINE - Bechtel National, Inc.  
23 STEPHEN LA PLANTE - Mariner's Village resident  
24 LEA LOIZOS - Arc Ecology  
25 ///

1                   OTHER ATTENDEES [Cont.]:

2

3 LAURA L. LOWMAN - United States Navy Radiological Affairs

4    Support Office (RASO)

5 RICHARD LOWMAN - United States Navy Radiological Affairs

6    Support Office (RASO)

7 QUIJUAN MALOOF - Pendergrass & Associates

8 LAURENT M. MEILLIER - San Francisco Bay Regional Water

9    Quality Control Board

10 CONNIE MOORE - United States Army

11 LOUIS MOORE

12 WILLIAM Q. NELSON - Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease

13    Registry (ATSDR) (guest speaker)

14 MARTIN OFFENHAUER - United States Navy

15 CHARLES H. PARDINI - Levine-Fricke for Lennar

16 WILLIE RATCLIFF - SAN FRANCISCO BAY VIEW,

17    African-American contractors

18 JOHN REID - Reid For Mayor

19 KAREN RENS - Colorado resident

20 TOM RENS - Colorado resident

21 LEE H. SAUNDERS - United States Navy

22 MATTHEW L. SHAPS, ESQ. - Paul Hastings LLP for Lennar

23 RITA SHIAU - San Francisco Department of Public Health

24    (guest speaker)

25 TOM SHOFF - Tetra Tech EM Inc.

1                   OTHER ATTENDEES [Cont.]:

2

3 CLIFTON SMITH - C.J. Smith & Associates

4 CAREY SMITH-MAREHI - The Urban School of San Francisco

5     student

6 MIKE STYVAERT - United States Army

7 STEPHEN F. TYAHLA - United States Navy ROICC

8 PETER WILSEY - San Francisco Department of Public Health

9                   ---oOo---

1 SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA, THURSDAY, JANUARY 23, 2003

2 6:00 P.M.

3 ---oOo---

4 MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay. Good evening,  
5 everybody. Happy new year.

6 ATTENDEE: Happy new year.

7 MS. PENDERGRASS: Happy new year. Has it been  
8 two months since we've met?

9 MR. TISDELL: Yes.

10 MS. PENDERGRASS: Seems like it's been long.

11 Well, welcome, everybody, to the first RAB  
12 meeting, Restoration Advisory Board meeting, for the  
13 Bayview-Hunters Point -- Hunters Point Shipyard. I'm  
14 sorry. Forget the "Bayview" part. Scratch that.  
15 Sorry. Welcome to the -- to the first meeting for 2003.

16 Tonight we have a really full agenda, and  
17 everybody should have an agenda tonight. Does everybody  
18 have them?

19 All of the subcommittee reports are on the back  
20 table. Agendas for tonight's meeting are on the back  
21 table, and sign-in sheet is on the back table. And  
22 remember, for those RAB members who have alternates  
23 tonight or who are alternates here for someone, please  
24 sign in.

25 Okay. Let's start with introductions, as

1 customary.

2 Hi, Lani, how are you tonight?

3 Okay. Shall --? Okay. Shall we start with

4 introductions?

5 You want to start with you tonight?

6 MR. TISDELL: Sure.

7 MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay.

8 MR. TISDELL: My name is Keith Tisdell. I'm

9 Membership & Bylaws Subcommittee chair, and I'm a

10 resident of the Bayview-Hunters Point.

11 MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay.

12 MR. TISDELL: Raiders association.

13 MS. ASHER: My name is Lani Asher. I'm an

14 artist out at the Shipyard.

15 MS. OLIVA: I'm Georgia Oliva. I'm a Shipyard

16 artist and member of CBE.

17 MS. FRANKLIN: I am Marie J. Franklin . . .

18 [unintelligible].

19 THE REPORTER: Can you speak up, please? I

20 can't hear you.

21 MS. FRANKLIN: Marie J. Franklin, Shoreview

22 Environmental and resident of Hunters Point. Thank you.

23 MR. KEICHLINE: Ronald Keichline, Bechtel,

24 community relations.

25 MS. LOIZOS: I'm Lea Loizos. I'm Chris



1 Shirley's alternate for Arc Ecology.

2 MR. CAMPBELL: I'm Maurice Campbell of BDI, New  
3 California Media.

4 MR. KAO: Chein Kao, State Department of Toxic  
5 Substances Control.

6 DR. BHATIA: Rajiv Bhatia, director of the  
7 Department of Public Health, Occupational &  
8 Environmental Health Section.

9 MS. SHIAU: I'm Rita Shiau, and I work for  
10 the --

11 THE REPORTER: I'm sorry?

12 MS. SHIAU: My name is Rita Shiau, and I work  
13 for the Department of Public Health.

14 MS. BROWNELL: Amy Brownell, San Francisco  
15 Health Department.

16 MR. WORK: Michael Work with the US  
17 Environmental Protection Agency.

18 MR. DACUS: Well, happy new years, everybody.  
19 My name is Charles L. Dacus, Sr. I'm affiliated with  
20 ROSES and also a RAB member.

21 MS. PETERSON: Dorothy Peterson, community  
22 member.

23 MS. BUSHNELL: Barbara Bushnell, RAB member,  
24 ROSES member, and resident.

25 MR. MASON: Jesse Mason, RAB member, Community

1 First Coalition, and Bayview Hunters Point Community  
2 Advocates.

3 MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay. I'm Marsha  
4 Pendergrass.

5 MR. OFFENHAUER: Marty Offenhauer, Navy RPM.

6 MR. DeMARS: I'm Dave DeMars, Navy Lead Project  
7 Manager.

8 MR. FORMAN: Keith Forman, Navy RAB Co-chair.

9 MR. BROWN: Lynne Brown, Co-chair of the  
10 Restoration Advisory Board.

11 MS. SUMCHAI: Ahimsa Sumchai, Radiological  
12 Subcommittee.

13 MR. MALOOF: Quijuan Maloof, Pendergrass &  
14 Associates.

15 MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay, now. We're going to  
16 get everybody who's in the audience as well to  
17 introduce yourself, but you need to kind of stand up and  
18 speak loudly 'cause we're actually recording this, and  
19 we'd like to catch that.

20 Yes, ma'am?

21 MS. LOWMAN: Laurie Lowman with the Navy  
22 Radiological Affairs Support Office.

23 MS. PENDERGRASS: Thank you.

24 MR. LOWMAN: Hi. I'm Dick Lowman. I'm with  
25 the same place.

1 MR. HANEY: I'm Bill Haney, New World  
2 Technology, the Navy radiological contractor.

3 MR. DeLONG: Daryl DeLong, New World  
4 Technology.

5 MS. PENDERGRASS: Yes, sir, right behind here.  
6 Let's start back here.

7 MR. PARDINI: Chuck Pardini, Levine-Fricke.

8 MR. HOCKER: Bob Hocker, Lennar/BVHP Team.

9 MR. SHAPS: Matt Shaps, environmental attorney  
10 for Lennar.

11 MS. PENDERGRASS: Did you get that?

12 MR. NELSON: I'm Bill Nelson with the Agency  
13 for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry.

14 MS. PENDERGRASS: All right. We have --  
15 Caroline, can you go ahead and . . . ? You're standing  
16 right there. Go ahead.

17 MS. WASHINGTON: Okay. I'm Caroline  
18 Washington. I'm member of RAB board and . . . , well,  
19 I'm here.

20 MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay.

21 Perhaps we can start over here and give those  
22 folks in the back a chance to get seated.

23 Yes, sir.

24 MR. DA COSTA: Francisco Da Costa,  
25 Environmental Justice Advocacy.

1 MR. ADAMS: I'm Harry Adams, and I'm just here  
2 to watch.

3 MS. SMITH-MAREHI: I'm Carey Smith-Marehi,  
4 student of The Urban School --

5 THE REPORTER: I'm sorry. What?

6 MS. SMITH-MAREHI: Carey Smith-Marehi. I'm an  
7 urban student at The Urban School of San Francisco.

8 MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay.

9 Yes, ma'am?

10 MS. LANE: Jackie Lane, EPA community  
11 involvement.

12 MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay.

13 Yes, sir.

14 MR. BOZEMAN: Andrew Bozeman, Heaven's Glade,  
15 economic development, and the Southeast Sector Community  
16 Development Corporation.

17 MS. PENDERGRASS: Thank you, sir.

18 Yes, sir.

19 MR. SMITH: Clifton Smith, environmental  
20 consultant.

21 MS. PENDERGRASS: That was Cliff?

22 MR. SMITH: Clifton.

23 MS. PENDERGRASS: Thank you, sir.

24 Yes, sir.

25 MR. LA PLANTE: Steve La Plante, resident of

1 Mariner's Village.

2 MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay.

3 Sir?

4 MS. KANESHIRO: Paula Kaneshiro . . .

5 THE REPORTER: Paula what?

6 MS. KANESHIRO: Kaneshiro.

7 MR. BURKARD: Mike Burkard, Denbeste

8 Transportation, Alameda Naval Air Station resident.

9 MS. PENDERGRASS: Yes, sir. Yes, sir.

10 MR. TYAHLA: Steve Tyahla, Navy Resident

11 Officer In Charge of Construction Office.

12 MS. PENDERGRASS: Thank you, sir.

13 Yes, sir.

14 MR. RENS: Tom Rens [phonetic], visiting from

15 Colorado.

16 MS. PENDERGRASS: Yes, sir.

17 Yes, ma'am.

18 MS. RENS: Karen Rens, visiting.

19 MS. PENDERGRASS: Yes, in the back, please.

20 MS. MOORE: Connie Moore from US Army.

21 MS. PENDERGRASS: Thank you, Connie.

22 MR. STYVAERT: Mike Styvaert, US Army.

23 MS. PENDERGRASS: Yes, sir.

24 MR. MOORE: Louis Moore . . .

25 MS. PENDERGRASS: That's "Louis Moore"? You,

1 sir, said "Louis Moore," sir?

2 MR. MOORE: Yes.

3 MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay. Thank you.

4 Christine, did you get that?

5 MR. SHOFF: Tom Shoff, Tetra Tech.

6 MR. ANSBRO: Jim Ansbro, resident.

7 MR. SAUNDERS: Lee Saunders, US Navy Public  
8 Affairs Office.

9 MR. FRAUSTO: [Inaudible.]

10 THE REPORTER: I didn't hear that.

11 MR. FRAUSTO: Herald Frausto. I live in . . .  
12 [inaudible].

13 MS. PENDERGRASS: Sir, can you repeat that? I  
14 can't -- I couldn't hear it either.

15 Mr. Maloof, can you repeat that? 'cause I  
16 couldn't hear it either.

17 Say it one more time. I'm sorry.

18 MR. FRAUSTO: My name is H-e-r-a-l-d-o and last  
19 name F-r-a-u-s-t-o.

20 MS. PENDERGRASS: Thank you, sir. Thank you.

21 Okay. We got some Tetra Tech people here.

22 Yes, get a chance to introduce yourself. Start here.

23 MS. HUNTER: Carolyn Hunter, Tetra Tech.

24 MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay.

25 MR. DAVENPORT: Doug Davenport with Tetra Tech.

1 MR. BIELSKIS: Doug Bielskis, Tetra Tech.

2 MS. PENDERGRASS: All right. And --

3 MR. MEILLIER: I'm Laurent Meillier, Regional  
4 Water Quality Control Board.

5 MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay. Please say that one  
6 more time.

7 MR. MEILLIER: Laurent Meillier from the  
8 Regional Water Quality Control Board.

9 MS. PENDERGRASS: Is there anybody we missed?

10 MS. PETERSON: There's some -- some children  
11 coming in in the back.

12 MS. PENDERGRASS: Please come forward if you'd  
13 like to . . .

14 MR. TISDELL: Please come forward.

15 MR. BROWN: Are you part of the --?

16 (Inaudible response.)

17 MR. TISDELL: Oh, okay.

18 MS. PENDERGRASS: All right.

19 Did I miss anybody? Everybody introduced?  
20 Okay.

21 Just remind everybody for the folks that are  
22 kind of new here, you know, the rest rooms are in the  
23 back and the left there. We can get the cell phones and  
24 kind of pagers turned off, and we'll take a break in  
25 about an hour so we can give our stenographer a break,

1 fingers a break.

2           And we are going to move on, and has everybody  
3 received the agenda? I mean -- I'm sorry. Minutes from  
4 last meeting. Okay. Anybody . . . ? Anybody . . . ?  
5 The minutes, going once.

6           MS. BUSHNELL: Oh, minutes?

7           MS. PENDERGRASS: Yes.

8           MS. BUSHNELL: There's a correction to the  
9 Subcommittee for Technical Review. It was on the 13th  
10 of November. And I brought copies of the minutes  
11 tonight. I e-mailed them to Chris Shirley on the 14th  
12 of November.

13          MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay. So you brought copies,  
14 and they are on the back table?

15          MS. BUSHNELL: No. I only brought one copy.

16          MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay.

17          MS. BUSHNELL: And Ron said he'd have it  
18 distributed.

19          MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay.

20          But did we get that correction, Ron?

21          MR. KEICHLINE: I believe so.

22          MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay.

23          Any other corrections or comments on the  
24 minutes? These minutes are dated December 5th. Need a  
25 motion.



1 MS. BUSHNELL: I make a motion to accept.

2 MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay. There's a motion on  
3 the floor to accept the minutes.

4 MR. BROWN: I make a motion.

5 MS. PENDERGRASS: Need a second.

6 MR. TISDELL: Second.

7 MS. PENDERGRASS: Got a second over here from  
8 Mr. Tisdell. All those in favor of accept -- in favor  
9 of accepting the minutes with the amendment as stated,  
10 say, "Aye."

11 THE BOARD: Aye.

12 MS. PENDERGRASS: Those opposed?  
13 Those abstaining?

14 MS. RAB MEMBER: Abstention.

15 MS. PENDERGRASS: One abstention?

16 MS. PETERSON: No.

17 MS. PENDERGRASS: Two abstentions? All right.  
18 Okay. So the minutes of December 5th are approved with  
19 the amendment.

20 Let's follow up on the action items that we had  
21 on that -- for that meeting. As you might recall, at  
22 our last meeting, we had an abbreviated agenda that  
23 included some open questions and -- and that sort of  
24 thing.

25 So one of the follow-ups of that was: Answers

1 to the pre-December RAB questions about "contracting and  
2 business issues at Hunters Point Shipyard." And that  
3 was due from the Navy.

4 MR. DeMARS: Right. And we do have written  
5 responses to those questions, and they are in the back  
6 table as handouts.

7 MS. PENDERGRASS: There was another action item  
8 that said: Provide answers to written Comment Sheet,  
9 follow-up [sic] questions submitted at the conclusion of  
10 the December 5th RAB meeting.

11 And those were included as well?

12 MR. DeMARS: Yes.

13 MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay.

14 So again, the answers to the questions that  
15 were asked, either prior to the December 5th meeting or  
16 at the December 5th meeting, the written responses are  
17 on the back table in written format.

18 Let's see. Number 3: "Get current USPS  
19 mailing addresses for RAB member Leilani Wright."

20 Ron, were you handling that?

21 MR. KEICHLINE: Yeah. I completed that at the  
22 meeting.

23 MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay.

24 Divide remaining unanswered written questions  
25 to their appropriate subcommittees and discuss with

1 representative [sic] subcommittee.

2           I think that the point of that was that the  
3 Navy and their representatives were supposed to attend  
4 the subsequent January meetings, and it's my  
5 understanding that that didn't happen with every  
6 subcommittee. Is that not --?

7           MR. DeMARS: That did not happen, so we -- we  
8 stand ready to attend the February subcommittee  
9 meetings --

10          MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay.

11          MR. DeMARS: -- and address the questions.

12          MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay. So in that regard --  
13 just -- just make sure we're all on the same page on  
14 that -- we want to make sure we get the dates of all the  
15 subcommittee meetings and that any issues or questions  
16 that came up that were submitted to the Navy or to the  
17 group -- to -- to the Board here for -- for follow-up  
18 and for answers, those questions will be addressed at  
19 either the subcommittee meeting that -- where it's  
20 pertinent or it's already addressed in written format in  
21 the back.

22          So the best avenue, if you have any in-depth  
23 questions, is to attend the subcommittee meeting. Okay.

24          And again, I want to make sure that the  
25 process -- the integrity of the process isn't

1 compromised. If you have a question and you feel that  
2 it has not been answered, you need to please send that  
3 as a follow-up to our RAB chair -- co-chairs.

4           Okay. "Risk Review and Health Assessment  
5 Subcommittee requests status update on Navy [sic]  
6 efforts to interview and collect oral histories of  
7 former employees at NRDL."

8           MR. FORMAN: That's part of our presentation  
9 tonight.

10          MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay. Very fine.

11          So there's no pending action items at this  
12 point.

13          At this point, we'll go ahead and do Navy  
14 announcements. Are you ready to do that?

15          MR. FORMAN: Sure.

16          We have a presentation tonight on the  
17 radiological program, so I won't go too much into that  
18 and steal Laurie Lowman's thunder.

19          But we put out a notification message that the  
20 draft final Historical Radiological Assessment is being  
21 delayed. We are not going to release it the end of  
22 January. And we will discuss that a little bit tonight  
23 and some of the what I think good things are that are  
24 coming out of that. If you were at the Radiological  
25 Subcommittee meeting last night with Dr. Sumchai, we

1 discussed that in depth.

2           The other project we have going on, the  
3 Community Relations Plan update. You've had a number of  
4 subcommittee meetings since then, and we thank you for  
5 all your input.

6           The subcommittee proposed 140 potential  
7 interviewees, and the Navy and the EPA are coordinating  
8 now and will begin doing the interviews within the next  
9 two or three weeks. Okay?

10           After that time, when the interviews have been  
11 completed, then the next subcommittee meeting will be  
12 scheduled.

13           That's all I have.

14           MS. PENDERGRASS: Lynne?

15           MR. BROWN: Yes. I'd like to tell the RAB  
16 members when the Lowmans do their presentations to keep  
17 the questions pertaining to Hunters Point and not Mare  
18 Island or Subic Bay or Pearl Harbor.

19           MS. PENDERGRASS: That's your report?

20           MR. BROWN: No. That's my announcement --

21           MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay.

22           MR. BROWN: -- for tonight.

23           MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay. All right.

24           As I said earlier, we do have a real packed  
25 agenda tonight. We have quite a few presentations. But

1 I'm going to put out a kind of preface here for -- for  
2 the presenters as well as the RAB board and the  
3 audience.

4           Tonight we're trying to get some information.  
5 I would suggest that if you have questions of the  
6 presenters, that you write those down on a card, submit  
7 those to us so that we can get those answers to you or  
8 answer those if we have time at the end of -- end of the  
9 agenda tonight.

10           For the presenters, I'm going to give you a  
11 little cue when it's ti- -- five minutes before the end  
12 of your presentation. So we need to really stick to the  
13 time line as it's outlined tonight. So if there are  
14 areas that you can condense and still get your point  
15 across, I'd really appreciate you doing that.

16           And if we can hold questions from the  
17 presentations until the end of the presentation and do  
18 that, that would be helpful to keep us on track tonight.  
19 Okay? Any questions about that?

20           All right, then. The way I understand it here,  
21 we're going to have a presentation from Bill Nelson.

22           And Mr. Nelson, you'll have till 6:35 for your  
23 presentation.

24           MR. DeMARS: Thank you.

25           By quick way of introduction for Bill, over the

1 past several RAB meetings, several members have  
2 expressed an interest in having ATSDR come before this  
3 body and to talk about the health assessment they did as  
4 a result of the landfill fire.

5           So we're very pleased to have Bill Nelson from  
6 ATSDR with us tonight, and he will go ahead and talk  
7 about the work that they did as a result of the landfill  
8 fire.

9           MR. NELSON: Could you maybe help pass some of  
10 these out [addressing Mr. Maloof]? I've got some more  
11 back there.

12           I'm not sure where to stand.

13           MR. TISDELL: Stand in the middle.

14           MR. FORMAN: Right in the middle.

15           MR. NELSON: I don't like people behind me.

16           MS. PENDERGRASS: Actually, the best place is  
17 right over here if you -- if you'd like to see everybody  
18 while you're talking --

19           MR. NELSON: Okay. That sounds fine.

20           MS. PENDERGRASS: -- if the cord will reach  
21 that far. Okay. Will it reach there? Perfect. Right  
22 there is a great place. Perfect.

23           MR. NELSON: Okay. That's fine.

24           I don't have any slides or anything, so I'll be  
25 basically just speaking.

1           But I do want to indicate that we have a number  
2 of what we call the health consultations for the  
3 Parcel E land fire -- landfill fire that occurred back  
4 in 2000, and that's going to be really the topic of my  
5 discussion.

6           My name is Bill Nelson. I'm the senior  
7 regional representative for an agency called the Agency  
8 for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry. It's an  
9 independent agency, but our sister agency is -- just to  
10 give you an idea of where we're at, we are a part of the  
11 Health and Human Services -- the US Health and Human  
12 Services, and our sister agency is the Center for  
13 Disease Control.

14           And in fact, what I heard this morning is:  
15 More than likely our agency will be merged in with the  
16 Center for Disease Control. But I've heard that before,  
17 and I'm not too sure just how soon that will happen.

18           As I mentioned, what we're going to be talking  
19 about tonight is our evaluation of the health of the  
20 Hunters Point Naval Shipyard Parcel E landfill.

21           We have been involved with Hunters Point for a  
22 good number of years. And in fact, back in 1994 we did  
23 what we called a complete health assessment. And when I  
24 say "a complete health assessment," that means that we  
25 looked at and evaluated all of the hazardous materials



1 on Hunters Point at the Naval Station and wrote up an  
2 evaluation to help determine who may have been exposed  
3 and what -- to what degree they may have been exposed  
4 to.

5           I did not bring any copies along because this  
6 is dated 1994 and it's outdated already because there's  
7 a lot more new data available for the Shipyard. And I  
8 came here basically to talk about our evaluation for the  
9 Parcel E landfill fire.

10           The reason I'm talking about the public health  
11 assessment is because it's a very, very complete  
12 assessment; and we looked at everything on the -- on the  
13 base.

14           The other situation, however, with the health  
15 consultation, it's a small document, and it's designed  
16 basically to address an individual issue. And we use  
17 this as a tool to help us determine what we need to do  
18 in the future.

19           Basically, when you receive the consultation,  
20 you'll have an opportunity to see some of the different  
21 graphs and issues such as that. But I wanted to  
22 describe to you basically how we came to the conclusions  
23 that we did and discuss with you the conclusions  
24 themselves.

25           One of the problems we ran into with the

1 landfill, of course, as you're probably all aware of, is  
2 the fact that we did not have any kind of environmental  
3 data when the fire was actually occurring. And we  
4 didn't really receive any environmental data until  
5 approximately two to three weeks afterwards.

6           We were actually involved and asked to attend  
7 and to examine the fire and the potential exposures to  
8 the fire by the Environmental Protection Agency. And  
9 they in turn asked me to also attend some of the  
10 community public meetings that occurred, which I did.

11           In terms of looking at the information that we  
12 had, since we didn't have any environmental data, we had  
13 to use a variety of modeling methods, for example, how  
14 hot was the fire, how high did it go, how wide was it.  
15 And we looked at those particular modeling methods and  
16 combined them together so that we could get a good idea  
17 of what was actually occurring there.

18           The other issue and things that we looked at,  
19 of course, was a lot of the situations, such as wind,  
20 wind speed, the direction of the wind, and any other  
21 kind of issues or situations that would help us better  
22 evaluate that.

23           Without having the data, without having any  
24 information on what was actually constituent to the fire  
25 at the time, we actually contacted and -- we contacted

1 three or four different states that had had similar  
2 fires in the past, and we also reviewed the literature.

3           It turns out that there's been anywhere from 8  
4 to 12 years' worth of -- of information that's been  
5 collected on the var- -- various landfill fires as well  
6 as rail -- rail wood fires and just wildfires in  
7 general.

8           And with all of this information -- and this  
9 was produced, if you will, obtained from a large number  
10 of sources: the Center for Disease Control, the  
11 Department of the Interior, the University of  
12 Washington, John Hopkins University, the National  
13 Institute of Occupational Safety and Health, and a whole  
14 lot of other agencies; and there's just a tremendous  
15 amount of literature available to help determine what  
16 the constituents of the fire like this are.

17           And what we did is: We reviewed all of that  
18 information, and we also spoke and called various health  
19 departments, at least three state health departments or,  
20 I should say, county health departments within the  
21 state, that had a lot of experience with fire in order  
22 to determine what kind of health effects and what kind  
23 of constituents were actually involved with the fire.

24           Basically, I guess the bottom line is that we  
25 found that if a person is exposed to a fire of a

1 relatively short duration, which means basically less  
2 than one year, and there's not a lot of multiple  
3 exposures; and based upon the types of chemicals that we  
4 found in the fires themselves, we felt that there were a  
5 very good likelihood and good possibility of what we  
6 call acute short-term exposures.

7           And these are the type of exposures that you  
8 would expect to run into in being exposed to smoke. You  
9 have particulate matter, and you have aldehydes; you  
10 have benzenes; you have a whole host of different types  
11 of both chemicals as well as particles in --

12           I'm sorry?

13           MR. ATTENDEE: [Inaudible.]

14           MR. NELSON: Okay -- in -- in the fire. And we  
15 were able to determine the likelihood of those producing  
16 short-term health effects.

17           We do feel that based upon the information that  
18 we have received in terms of the wind direction and the  
19 various topography of the -- of the area where the  
20 landfill was, that most of the contaminants were  
21 actually directed along with the wind, which went back  
22 into the bay area. And the wind was base -- essentially  
23 going from -- from west to the east. So we don't  
24 believe that the exposure was -- was necessarily  
25 significant.

1           But at the same time, during the smoldering,  
2 which occurred approximately two to three weeks and  
3 lasted for about a month after that, there were a number  
4 of individuals who had indicated that they had seen  
5 smoke swirling around, and we do have some documentation  
6 of that.

7           And if this is true when that occurred and it  
8 did go over the populated area, then you would expect to  
9 see the potential for having short-term effects.

10           However, even with all of the kind of  
11 information that's available to us, we did not find any  
12 chronic or long-term effects. The short-term effects  
13 had to do more with eye burning, respiratory issues with  
14 people that might have asthma having more of a -- more  
15 difficult time in having upper respiratory issues and  
16 problems.

17           In addition to that, we did attend, as I  
18 mentioned before, a number of community meetings. So we  
19 did get a pretty good feeling of what the concerns of  
20 the community were. We did speak to a number of people  
21 who had complained of having those short-term effects.

22           And we also contacted the San Francisco Health  
23 Department; and in -- in the meantime, I also contacted  
24 and had contacted the Pediatric Environmental Health  
25 Unit, which is located at San Francisco General

1 Hospital.

2           And although we did expect to see some  
3 short-term and hopefully reversible -- I won't say  
4 "hopefully reversible," but basically the information we  
5 have, it has been reversible of short-term health  
6 effects. But we did not see any long-term health  
7 effects, nor had we ever seen any of that in any of the  
8 literature.

9           Basically, one of the things that we're looking  
10 at and has to do with the health consultation, as I  
11 mentioned, it's more of a tool for us to help determine  
12 what we need to do in the future. After looking at the  
13 information we have and coming to the conclusions that  
14 we have, we didn't feel that there was really anything  
15 more that we could do.

16           The health effects would be acute, they would  
17 be short-term, and we would expect them to disappear  
18 within probably two to three weeks. And we did not see  
19 any -- any kind of increases in any -- in any chronic  
20 situations.

21           As you probably know, there were some actual  
22 environmental samples that were obtained after the fire  
23 itself and especially during the smoldering activities.  
24 We did review all of those particular chemicals that  
25 were identified.

1           And we only found really two of them that  
2 were -- that -- that exceeded what we called the ambient  
3 air quality standards, and that was manganese and  
4 benzene.

5           We compared those to what we call the no  
6 observable effects limit, which means a person can be  
7 exposed to that particular chemical up to a certain  
8 point and not expect to see any kind of health effects.

9           We evaluated both manganese as well as benzene  
10 to those particular standards. And in terms of  
11 manganese, it was almost 400 times lower than what you  
12 would expect to see for someone having adverse health  
13 effects. And for benzenes it was approximately 35 times  
14 lower.

15           So given those issues, we did not feel that  
16 either benzene or magnesium was -- manganese was a  
17 problem at that point.

18           We did make some recommendations. We made  
19 recommendations to the Navy indicating that we felt they  
20 needed to set up a community relations program in terms  
21 of being able to notify the community in case -- in the  
22 event of their having any planned fires and also set up  
23 some kind of emergency response system to notify the  
24 community just in case they had some other kind of  
25 unplanned releases, if you will.

1           And that's basically my presentation.

2           I should mention that there were a lot of --  
3 lot of people involved in this, both the Environmental  
4 Protection Agency, the city health department, the  
5 state, as well as ATSDR. And basically, once you  
6 receive a health consultation, you'll have a better idea  
7 what I meant when I'm talking about the wind direction  
8 in the area that could be impacted. Thank you.

9           Yes.

10          MS. PENDERGRASS: Excuse me. Let's take a  
11 stack on the questions so we can make sure we get  
12 everybody. Lynne, Ray, Ahimsa, Mr. Tisdell. Okay.

13          And then we'll lead with you. Okay? So we can  
14 start it. Go ahead. I'm sorry.

15          MR. BROWN: I have one question. How do you  
16 do, Bill? My name's Lynne Brown. I just have one  
17 question.

18          What happened to the fact sheet that was put  
19 out in 2000 -- in April 2001? And we couldn't find it  
20 on your -- the Web site.

21          MR. NELSON: I didn't realize that you couldn't  
22 find it. I haven't looked at that on the Web -- Web  
23 site.

24          I do have copies of the fact sheet here. And  
25 in fact, I'm sorry, I meant to pass them out along with



1 the consultation, but I'll pass them as soon as I'm --  
2 as soon as I'm through.

3 MS. PENDERGRASS: Mr. Tompkins.

4 MR. TOMPKINS: Thank you.

5 MR. NELSON: The fact sheet that he's referring  
6 to is a summary, if you will, of the health  
7 consultation.

8 MS. PENDERGRASS: Quickly.

9 MR. TOMPKINS: Thank you. I have a series of  
10 questions. I'll try and limit them and be brief.

11 One, in your statement that I heard you say  
12 that basically the wind was blowing from the west to  
13 east, did it take into account topography of the land?

14 MR. NELSON: I'm sorry. Say that again.

15 MR. TOMPKINS: Did it take into account  
16 topography of the land in terms of the actual  
17 direction --?

18 When you put wind currents, you have turbulence  
19 behind, you have swirling effect. There's a hill up on  
20 the point.

21 Therefore, when you -- in terms of the bulletin  
22 that I received from the Navy and the assessment of  
23 about a paragraph, plus saying there were no effects of  
24 the fire, that, one, the measurements, as I understand  
25 it, that was presented in the community meeting were

1 samples taken 22 to 27 days after the fire.

2           Therefore, I find it grievous misrepresentation  
3 to make that statement; and in fact, there were no air  
4 samples that deal with measurement, the concentrations,  
5 or chemical exposure to the population or the  
6 concentrations that went over to my brother's house and  
7 his children inhaled.

8           How could that be drawn as a conclusion of no  
9 effects on the population?

10           MR. NELSON: Well, we didn't -- I guess that's  
11 my point. I'm not saying there were no effects. People  
12 were exposed. People could have had short-term effects.  
13 And I think that's -- that's the message I'm trying to  
14 get across.

15           MR. TOMPKINS: But --

16           MR. NELSON: What we wouldn't expect is  
17 long-term effects.

18           MR. TOMPKINS: But --

19           MR. NELSON: Wind, as you mentioned -- and I --  
20 if I said it was going from east to west, I was -- I was  
21 mistaken. It's coming in from the ocean. It's going  
22 from west --

23           MR. TOMPKINS: West to east.

24           MR. NELSON: -- west to east --

25           MR. TOMPKINS: Go ahead.

1           MR. NELSON:  -- and -- and because it does go  
2 out over the bay, if you will.

3           And if you look at the last few figures that I  
4 have in here -- and I'm real sorry I didn't put a slide  
5 up here.

6           MR. TOMPKINS:  Okay.

7           MR. NELSON:  But just to -- just to give you an  
8 idea -- be very -- very hard for you individuals to see,  
9 but we do have lines that indicate where the wind --  
10 where the -- where the concentrations are in  
11 relationship to the wind, both during the fire as well  
12 as during the smoldering.

13          And you'll see that this is where the fire  
14 is -- or where the fire was, and this area is around  
15 here the average wind direction and where the  
16 contamination might have gone.

17          We did take into consideration the elevations.  
18 We did take into consideration, if you look at this, the  
19 swirly motion and the changes, because the wind rose  
20 actually gives you just an average.  It doesn't  
21 necessarily go over time.  It doesn't necessarily show  
22 that there could be changes.

23          MR. TOMPKINS:  So --

24          MS. PENDERGRASS:  Mr. Tompkins?

25          MR. TOMPKINS:  -- that's one of the points.

1 Two things:

2 One, for the information that was presented to  
3 us at the RAB that the only air-monitoring station that  
4 was given reference point was over Parcel B. The fire  
5 took place in Parcel E. Different part of the base,  
6 different area.

7 Therefore, that would be invalid because it's  
8 two different parts of the neighborhood to say what took  
9 place here on this side of the hill as corresponding and  
10 exactly the same as the other.

11 Second thing, what long-term studies are you  
12 referring to that have been done? I don't know any. I  
13 don't know if Keith knows of any. We have been  
14 talking -- Are there any in terms of measurables?

15 I remember, Keith, we argued about in terms of  
16 chemical exposure the most acute high-risk population  
17 to, one, examine the stillbirth rate, low-birth rate,  
18 premie birth rate; and a lot of times because of racism,  
19 it gets played in -- played off as being crack babies.

20 How are you making the delineations on this?  
21 If you please let me know what studies were done.

22 MR. NELSON: Okay. I have a listing of the  
23 studies as an appendix to the health consultation  
24 itself. And they're -- they're quite -- there's --  
25 there's a lot of them. There's a tremendous number of

1 them. And they do go along for quite some time. I can  
2 give you a lot more specific information on that if you  
3 prefer.

4 MR. TOMPKINS: And with manganese in your  
5 literature and in your risk assessments, are you basing  
6 this on the normal EPA standards for 35-year-old healthy  
7 white male, knowing that African-Americans, those who  
8 have melanin in their skin, have higher risk factors for  
9 toxicity with manganese?

10 MR. NELSON: No. The overall -- NOAEL, if you  
11 will, the no observable adverse effects, is not based on  
12 a 35-year-old male. We based it on a child that could  
13 be, you know, a sensitive population, population group.

14 MR. TOMPKINS: Sub- --

15 MR. NELSON: What I was referring to in terms  
16 of the mag- -- manganese being low is: It was -- it  
17 was -- It exceeded the air ambient quality, which means  
18 that it was there, but it was a little bit higher than  
19 what you would ordinarily see in air.

20 MR. TOMPKINS: And this is the air study 22 to  
21 27 days after the fire?

22 MR. NELSON: I would have to look up the  
23 specific time.

24 MR. TOMPKINS: And therefore, you don't --?

25 Therefore, is there something different from

1 what we were presented in terms of --?

2 MS. PENDERGRASS: Mr. Tompkins, we are going to

3 have to kind of take --

4 MR. TOMPKINS: Okay.

5 MS. PENDERGRASS: -- your questions either --

6 MR. TOMPKINS: I understand --

7 MS. PENDERGRASS: -- written down --

8 MR. TOMPKINS: -- but I just want to know --

9 MS. PENDERGRASS: -- so that you can get that,

10 or invite them to the subcommittee meeting of yours --

11 MR. TOMPKINS: We have done that.

12 MS. PENDERGRASS: -- so that we can get that.

13 Okay.

14 MR. TOMPKINS: That's why we are kind of

15 anxious.

16 MS. PENDERGRASS: Dr. Sumchai, you are going to

17 be the last question for this.

18 MS. SUMCHAI: I actually want to reiterate the

19 validity of Ray Tompkins' concerns.

20 You cannot without a prospective study in which

21 today you are looking at this population. You know,

22 this fire was on August 2000. So you would need a

23 prospective study that includes August 2001,

24 August 2002, August 2003 before you can look at this

25 population and say that you have excluded long-term

1 effects, especially with substances like manganese and  
2 benzene that you've identified that have chronic  
3 effects.

4           Benzene is a Class A carcinogen. The World  
5 Health Organization had classified it called childhood  
6 leukemia, lymphoma, bone marrow suppression, DNA  
7 abnormalities.

8           And if you determine that these two substances  
9 were elevated above ambient air, then to say that there  
10 were no long-term effects, you would have to have a  
11 study going on right now. You would need a prospective  
12 study right now. And if you don't have that study, you  
13 can't say that. You simply cannot scientifically say  
14 that.

15           MR. NELSON: I should have probably stated it's  
16 unlikely that we are going to have long-term problems.  
17 I'm sorry I omitted that word. But it's unlikely.

18           Based on all the studies that we've seen in the  
19 past, since we did not have any good data at that time,  
20 that was the best information we have.

21           But the information that we have is very, very  
22 comprehensive. The various agencies or states that I  
23 indicated before where we obtained this information,  
24 they've got a lot of studies that go on for a continued  
25 long time. We don't have the ability to go forward at

1 this point in time.

2 MS. PENDERGRASS: Mr. Nelson, thank you for  
3 your presentation. However, I do think that there are a  
4 number of still unresolved questions, and I would invite  
5 us -- I'm sorry we had to cut the questions.

6 MR. TISDELL: That's not right. That is not --

7 ATTENDEE: Sh, sh, sh.

8 MR. TISDELL: -- right.

9 ATTENDEE: Sh, sh.

10 MR. TISDELL: No.

11 ATTENDEE: Sh.

12 MR. TISDELL: Nothing. "Sh" nothing.

13 MS. PIERCE: Point of order.

14 MR. TISDELL: That's not right.

15 MS. PIERCE: Point of order.

16 MR. TISDELL: That's not right.

17 MS. PIERCE: Point of order.

18 I would like to make a request. We did not  
19 invite this gentleman to come to the risk assessment  
20 meeting because we felt it was more important for the  
21 larger body to hear this report.

22 So I would like to -- I will make a motion that  
23 we extend the time for this report to have all questions  
24 answered, and we take a look at the agenda to see what  
25 can be put over to the next meeting so we can complete



1 this report.

2 MS. PENDERGRASS: Do I hear a second?

3 MR. NELSON: I don't -- I don't mean to

4 interrupt this particular meeting. I'll be more than

5 happy to come back if you like.

6 MS. PIERCE: But not everybody can make it to

7 the subcommittee meeting, and they are here tonight.

8 So Ray, could you second?

9 MS. PENDERGRASS: There's a motion on the

10 floor.

11 MR. TOMPKINS: I second it.

12 MS. PENDERGRASS: There's a second to the

13 motion.

14 Just to paraphrase, the motion is that we

15 eliminate another report to continue this report. All

16 in favor?

17 THE BOARD: Aye.

18 MS. PENDERGRASS: Those opposed?

19 Okay. At this point, then, we're asking

20 Mr. Nelson to complete the round of questions that the

21 audience has.

22 I would still strongly recommend that if you

23 have unresolved questions after -- after this point,

24 that we put them in writing and take this to a

25 subcommittee report or at least get in writing the

1 answer to these questions.

2           Mr. Tisdell, we'll pick up with you at this  
3 point.

4           MR. TISDELL: Okay. I can't remember your  
5 name. But --

6           MS. PENDERGRASS: Mr. Nelson.

7           MR. TISDELL: -- you say the -- the wind was  
8 going from "west to east," right, or east to west?

9           MR. NELSON: West to east.

10          MR. TISDELL: West to east?

11          Well, there's a contradictory [sic], and  
12 Mr. DeMars can tell you. Richard Mach stated that the  
13 wind was blowing north. And you know, I don't  
14 understand how a person can -- can be down and inhaling  
15 smoke from God knows what for over a month and not have  
16 no long-term effect, you know.

17          Now, you know, it's just like, okay, I can go  
18 down and start a fire and tell you stay down there and  
19 inhale that smoke for a month and you going to be all  
20 right. That's it.

21          MR. NELSON: Okay. Just a point of  
22 clarification. We obtained the wind information from  
23 the airport in San Francisco.

24          MR. TISDELL: They did too.

25          MR. NELSON: We compared that along with the

1 Oakland Airport to make sure that they were all  
2 matching.

3           Keep in mind that I'm talking -- when I'm  
4 talking about the wind direction, just talking about the  
5 average. The wind does change. It will change  
6 according to, you know, whatever gusts might occur. But  
7 I'm talking about the predominant wind at this point in  
8 time.

9           MS. PENDERGRASS: Miss Oliva?

10          MS. OLIVA: Mr. Nelson, thank you very much.  
11 On page 9 of your report, it states the analysis  
12 included particulates, pesticides, polychlorinated  
13 biphenyls, et cetera, et cetera, vials, organic  
14 compounds, metals, dioxins, chlorine, hydrogen; and the  
15 very last one is radioactivity.

16          However, in your report in the back, it's not  
17 on there at all. That wasn't tested for. And I'd like  
18 to -- wonder why it's on page 9 and not in the back.

19          And also, on page 5, it says the current land  
20 use, and it states that there are 250 of us at Hunters  
21 Point, and we would like to be considered in any study  
22 that's done. Thank you.

23          MR. NELSON: We didn't feel that the --  
24 the . . . I'm sorry.

25          We didn't -- we didn't feel that the radium was

1 a problem. We had evaluated the radium even prior to  
2 that back in our full health assessment, and these  
3 levels for radium were so low that we didn't feel that  
4 they would present a health problem.

5           And in terms of any potential additional study,  
6 one of the things that our health consultations does for  
7 us is to help us determine whether or not a study is  
8 necessary or could be needed or could be helpful. And  
9 based on the conclusions that we have, we don't feel  
10 that a health study should be -- should be conducted at  
11 this point.

12           MS. OLIVA: The existence of U-235, which was  
13 documented two years ago, it takes a while for you to  
14 get really sick from any radioac- -- radium -- uranium  
15 because -- and -- you know, it's a question of leukemia  
16 and blood work and all that, because -- and it's a good  
17 two-year process to four years. Imagine if you look at  
18 the documentation of the military in Kosovo.

19           So I think it needs to be a little more  
20 extended instead of --

21           MR. NELSON: Okay. I'm going to refer that to  
22 the San Francisco Health Department. I'm under the  
23 impression and I believe that they are the ones that  
24 actually did that -- that particular testing. If I'm  
25 wrong, I can find out who did it, but I believe that

1 they did.

2 MS. OLIVA: Thank you.

3 MR. NELSON: And I think that they can answer  
4 that better than I can.

5 MS. PENDERGRASS: Well, we do have a  
6 presentation tonight from the Health Department.

7 MR. NELSON: Yes, they're going to be  
8 presenting right after -- right after --

9 MS. PENDERGRASS: We have another question from  
10 the -- from the Board. We have --

11 Mr. Campbell?

12 MR. CAMPBELL: Bill, I'm somewhat familiar with  
13 your 1984 [sic] report and your studies of Parcel E.  
14 Can you tell us what is in Parcel E? Are you  
15 aware of what's in Parcel E?

16 MR. NELSON: In terms of the landfill?

17 MR. CAMPBELL: In terms of the landfill.

18 MR. NELSON: Yes.

19 MR. CAMPBELL: You can tell us definitively  
20 what's in there?

21 MR. NELSON: From the various samplings that  
22 have been going on, we can tell what we -- as much as we  
23 know about it, yes.

24 MR. CAMPBELL: Okay, because we have got -- we  
25 have gotten some impressions here. We have heard the

1 EPA say it might be too dangerous to re- -- to be  
2 removed. That's one statement we have heard.

3 And we have heard -- in your report it said  
4 people have to be very careful about putting in  
5 monitoring wells because of the methane problem and  
6 where they are put because there could be explosions.

7 Now -- So we know something that's pressured.  
8 We know that there was a fire. And unless you can tell  
9 us definitively what burned, you can't tell us  
10 definitively how -- what cause and effect it had.

11 Now, one more question about this: August  
12 16th, when were you notified? When did you get  
13 involved? We'd like to have that bottom-line date,  
14 please.

15 MR. NELSON: I was involved two days after the  
16 EPA was notified.

17 MR. CAMPBELL: Okay. And the E -- okay. On --  
18 I'm sorry. When was the EPA notified?

19 MR. BROWN: Twenty-seven days after.

20 MR. CAMPBELL: Twenty-seven days after.

21 So basically, you have no data when the fire  
22 was at its point. That's -- that's two weeks.

23 MR. NELSON: Yes, that's correct.

24 MR. CAMPBELL: So you don't know what the  
25 exposures were to the community at that point; is that

1 correct?

2 MR. NELSON: What I attempted to do was to show  
3 you and tell you that we went and obtained a lot of  
4 information from very, very similar type of fires; and  
5 without having any --

6 MR. CAMPBELL: Okay, but similar type of fires  
7 would have to have similar type --

8 MS. PENDERGRASS: Mr. Campbell?

9 MR. CAMPBELL: -- similar type --

10 MS. PENDERGRASS: Mr. Campbell?

11 MR. CAMPBELL: -- of landfills --

12 MS. PENDERGRASS: Mr. Campbell, let him finish  
13 the answer, please.

14 MR. NELSON: That's what we had to base our  
15 assumptions and recommendations on because we did not  
16 have any real data at that time.

17 MR. CAMPBELL: Okay. So on -- on the -- on  
18 your models, on the landfills, they had similar  
19 characteristics: PCBs, radiological materials, other  
20 things, chlorine, et cetera. They had those things, and  
21 that's what you based your model on; is that correct?

22 MR. NELSON: That's correct.

23 MR. CAMPBELL: Okay. Thank you.

24 MS. PENDERGRASS: Thank you, Mr. Campbell.

25 Thank you, Mr. Nelson. I don't see any other

1 questions at this point.

2           MR. TOMPKINS: Point of clarification. From  
3 the information I was given from RASO dealing with  
4 Triple A that's been part of my advocacy on this  
5 committee, every time we have a fire, due to the data  
6 and information gathered, we don't know because there's  
7 an X factor of an unknown, so we don't know where Triple  
8 A [sic]. That's why they were fined \$80 million before  
9 the deal was cut.

10           So every fire that's on this base is a  
11 potential chemical hazard based on the information  
12 presented before us.

13           MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay.

14           MR. TOMPKINS: Therefore, what models can you  
15 have in terms of making this projection of making risk  
16 assessment when you have such a large unknown factor?

17           How do you calculate and, say, make an  
18 assessment no risk, minimal risk, only short-term effect  
19 or long-term --

20           MR. NELSON: Basically --

21           MR. TOMPKINS: -- or is it this big unknown?

22           MR. NELSON: Basically from the past history of  
23 the previous fires.

24           MS. PENDERGRASS: All right.

25           MR. NELSON: I will be available after the



1 meeting, so . . .

2 MS. PENDERGRASS: All right.

3 MR. TOMPKINS: Okay.

4 MS. PENDERGRASS: Miss Asher, can your question  
5 wait till after, or do you want to make that now?

6 MS. ASHER: I just -- I guess I just -- I just  
7 want to say that if you use these other fires for a  
8 model, I just -- there's something about that that I  
9 just don't think is adequate is my basic response to  
10 that, because the fact that there's no data for the --  
11 for the first two weeks of exposure and using other  
12 locations doesn't seem to make much sense. So I just  
13 want to express that. Thank you.

14 MR. NELSON: Okay. Well, that's -- that's  
15 fine. It would have been much more preferable if we had  
16 data.

17 MS. PENDERGRASS: All right.

18 MR. FORMAN: Did anyone want to invite him to  
19 the next subcommittee meeting just so he knows up front  
20 now or --

21 MS. PENDERGRASS: Miss Pierce?

22 MR. FORMAN: -- a follow-on meeting or --?

23 MS. PIERCE: I --

24 MR. BROWN: We'd like to invite him to the  
25 technical meeting.

1 MS. PENDERGRASS: Why don't we -- why don't we  
2 talk about that at the break and --

3 MS. ATTENDEE: Yeah.

4 MS. PENDERGRASS: -- if he's still going to be  
5 here?

6 Mr. Nelson, are you going to be here to --?

7 Okay. And we can see that if you are, we'll make sure  
8 we put that on so people will be advised.

9 We need to move on a little quickly. We've  
10 shoved some things. They are g- -- are dropping off the  
11 agenda as we speak because of our time.

12 So I'm going to have to insist that we hold the  
13 questions till the end of the next presentation. I'm  
14 also going to have to insist that the presenters present  
15 in their allotted time or less.

16 Where are our presenters, and who will be doing  
17 that introduction?

18 Lynne, are you doing the introduction of the  
19 Health Department?

20 MS. BROWNELL: No, no. That's okay. I'll do  
21 it real quickly.

22 MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay.

23 MS. BROWNELL: Rajiv Bhatia and Rita Shiau are  
24 here to do the presentation.

25 MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay. Thank you, Amy.

1 DR. BHATIA: We're going to walk -- we're going  
2 to walk up to the front and pick up the mic.

3 MS. PENDERGRASS: All right.

4 MS. BROWNELL: And I'll hand out the handouts.

5 MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay. Great.

6 So you have roughly fifteen minutes. I'm  
7 sorry.

8 DR. BHATIA: Okay. So fifteen minutes is fine  
9 for us.

10 MS. PENDERGRASS: Stop at 7:00.

11 DR. BHATIA: I'm Rajiv Bhatia. I direct the  
12 Occupational & Environmental Health Section of the San  
13 Francisco Health Department. This is Rita Shiau. She's  
14 an epidemiologist with our section.

15 I want to talk about the analysis we did of  
16 the -- of asthma hospitalizations dur- -- before,  
17 during, and after the time of the Shipyard fire. I  
18 think this might answer some of the questions that  
19 are -- had been posed to Mr. Nelson. It will not answer  
20 all of those questions.

21 What I want to -- if we can sort of go in the  
22 first slide.

23 I want to sort of talk about process, working  
24 with -- and our lessons in working with community have  
25 made us very attentive to process.

1           So we were following the fire, and I won't  
2 recapitulate the events of the fire. We were asked to  
3 look into possible health effects of the fire.

4           We went to several community meetings. In  
5 particular, at a health and environmental task force  
6 meeting, we discussed several options for doing analyses  
7 in this community setting, given the limitations of data  
8 that we had.

9           We chose to do a study of asthma  
10 hospitalizations in this -- after this community  
11 meeting. I'll explain some of the reasons for that in  
12 the next slide.

13           We -- It takes a long time to get the data  
14 because all of the data for hospitalizations for the  
15 whole city have to be collected. They go to the state.  
16 They are proofread, if you will, and corrected. And  
17 they come back to us. They come back to us for  
18 analysis.

19           We didn't get the data till the summer of this  
20 year. We were waiting for data through 2001. We  
21 analyzed the data this fall, and now we're sharing it  
22 back with you.

23           We have not published this report. The first  
24 place that we are taking this report is to the  
25 community. We want the community to have ample

1 opportunity to comment on it and ask us questions.  
2 Those comments will either be incorporated into the  
3 report, or they will be part of or questions and answers  
4 attached to the report.

5           So that's our process. And then we'll finalize  
6 it, and we'll make it available to the public. But we  
7 won't make it available to the public before that time.

8           Next slide, please.

9           So why did we choose to look at asthma  
10 hospitalization? Well, as we heard from Bill, as we --  
11 that the fire would have possible effects on res- -- on  
12 the respiratory system. We know from other urban fires  
13 from other fire situations with firefighters that this  
14 is true. It's also intuitive.

15           We know that asthma is a sensitive indicator of  
16 air pollution. It's probably one of the most sensitive  
17 indicators of air pollution of all sorts.

18           We know that asthma is a disease of great deal  
19 of concern in this community. It -- We -- Anecdotally  
20 we heard that asthma might have been increased by this  
21 event.

22           Fourth and very important, we had consistent  
23 data collection before, during, and after the fire on  
24 hospitalizations. We can't say the same thing for  
25 other -- other forms of health outcomes. Health

1 outcomes such as mortality we had a lot of -- we have  
2 consistent data for, but we weren't expecting something  
3 that severe to have happened. And the event is -- would  
4 be more infrequent.

5           We also knew that other studies have used very  
6 similar approaches to look at the effects of urban  
7 fires. In particular, the -- an urban fire in the East  
8 Bay was studied by this approach by the State Department  
9 of Health. So that's why we did it.

10           I'm going to hand the microphone over to Rita  
11 now who's going to present the -- more details of the  
12 approach to the analysis and the results.

13           MS. SHIAU: I just wanted to summarize a little  
14 bit of the study that we had done that Rajiv mentioned  
15 with San Francisco General Hospital emergency admission  
16 counts. This is the report that we had finished back in  
17 July, and this is what we looked at. This is basically  
18 a chart that's representative of what we found from this  
19 data.

20           And in these arrows would show during the fire  
21 period, and the data starts one year before the fire in  
22 1999 and one year after the fire in 2001.

23           And here we see that there are some dots in the  
24 data. It's -- Actually, we had also seen similar jumps  
25 in other parts of the years also. We don't consider

1 that to be unusual during the fire. But we do realize  
2 that there were drawbacks to using this data, mostly  
3 because we realize that there are people who might have  
4 experienced symptoms from the fire but who didn't go to  
5 SFGH for treatment.

6           So we decided that -- to request data from the  
7 state to look at maybe there were other hospitals that  
8 were visited by -- by people who may have experienced  
9 symptoms of the fire. So that brings us to our present  
10 analysis.

11           To give you a little bit of background on data  
12 source, we do get data from the state from the Office of  
13 Statewide Health, Planning and Development. The nature  
14 of this data is weekly hospital admission counts for  
15 asthma and other diseases in January 1997 to December of  
16 2000.

17           And the thing to point out about this data is  
18 that I had selected all the patients who reported home  
19 ZIP Codes in San Francisco. So this also includes  
20 patients who might have experienced some symptoms that  
21 they went to naval hospitals in other cities to seek  
22 care. So we are hoping that this will be a more  
23 comprehensive data.

24           I have made a few different comparisons within  
25 the analysis, and these are the four types of

1 comparisons I made.

2 I looked at different age groups: 0 to 14,  
3 15 to 64, and 65 plus. Compared different locations, so  
4 residents of the Hunters Point versus Visitacion Valley  
5 and also all the other areas of San Francisco.  
6 Different time frames: Compared the amount of  
7 admissions during the fire period and also during the  
8 same months of the previous three years.

9 And lastly, we made some comparisons within  
10 different disease categories, and that's asthma versus  
11 other respiratory illnesses, which is all upper and  
12 lower respiratory illnesses, as well as exposure to fire  
13 fumes and also eye irritations. That's all included in  
14 this second category and "all other diagnoses."

15 Before we go on to present the results, I did  
16 two types of graphs --

17 ATTENDEE: [Inaudible.]

18 MS. SHIAU: Okay.

19 I did two types of graphs for -- for this  
20 analysis.

21 The one on the left, which presents data as it  
22 is, allows us to look at any acute events that might  
23 have happened. So if there are any -- anything, like,  
24 any big spikes in the amount of admissions in the fire,  
25 we were able to see that in this graph.



1           It shows the acute events very well, but it's  
2 hard to see trends. And within this kind of graph, it's  
3 easier to see any increases and decreases in that.

4           So we have -- basically asked three questions.  
5 The first question looking just at Bayview residents  
6 during the year of the fire, were there any increases  
7 during the time of the fire?

8           And I'd like to point out, this graph, which --  
9 the solid line represents the amount of asthma  
10 admissions and these arrows representing the fire  
11 period, and we do not in this graph see any unusual  
12 increases for asthma hospitalizations during the fire  
13 period, within the fire period, and also compared to the  
14 rest of the year.

15          So then we went on to the second question,  
16 which has to do with comparing the hospital admissions  
17 for the fire period, how does it compare to the years  
18 before that?

19          And the fire period is highlighted between  
20 these two dotted lines, and then the comparison periods  
21 are highlighted within these other dotted lines. And we  
22 see while there seems to be an increasing trend during  
23 the fire period, it is not unusual compared to the years  
24 before that. So -- so we concluded that the increase  
25 during and after the fire is not unusual for that time

1 of the year.

2           And then last question that we have is that did  
3 hospital admissions for asthma in Bayview-Hunters Point  
4 unusually increase during the fire period compared to  
5 other regions in San Francisco?

6           And in this graph, the solid line represents  
7 the asthma admissions for Bayview-Hunters Point, and  
8 then the dotted line represents the asthma admissions  
9 for Visitacion Valley during that same time.

10           And we see that in general Bayview-Hunters  
11 Point tends to have more asthma admissions. But we do  
12 see that they take generally the same shape over the  
13 years that the data were collected.

14           Again, within looking at this period, I don't  
15 see that there's any exceptional increases in admissions  
16 in Bayview-Hunters Point during the fire period compared  
17 to other San Francisco areas, and we have the same  
18 results for similar respiratory diseases. And these  
19 graphs are all found within the draft handout that we  
20 handed out.

21           Our conclusion was that based on the data that  
22 we have, we do not see any evidence for significant  
23 increases in hospital admissions for asthma or other  
24 respiratory diseases among Bayview residents during the  
25 time of the fire.

1 But we do realize that our data is limited as  
2 well. We do know that a lot of people who might  
3 experience fire symptoms might not visit hospitals.  
4 Their symptoms may not be as severe as hospitalization.  
5 And so we have no way of accounting for anyone who might  
6 have visited outpatient clinics or have treated  
7 themselves at home. So we do realize this. Thank you.

8 MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay. At this point, we are  
9 going to hold our questions. We'll formulate those  
10 questions, and we'll have those after the break.

11 So we're going to take a ten-minute break and  
12 come back at exactly 7:10. Okay.

13 (Recess 7:01 p.m. to 7:10 p.m.)

14 MS. PENDERGRASS: I'd like to bring the meeting  
15 to order, please.

16 All right. Did we have some questions that  
17 we'd like to ask --?

18 MS. RINES: All right, people. Let's go.  
19 Let's go.

20 MS. PENDERGRASS: Actually, the best way to  
21 handle the questions about the risk assessment study  
22 here in terms of the Health Department -- the best way  
23 to do this would actually to be to let's get these  
24 questions in writing so we can get firm documented  
25 answers to them.

1           So unless somebody has a clarifying question  
2 about it, if you have a question about the methodology  
3 or the study or something like that . . . Okay. Bar  
4 nothing, I guess --

5           MS. RINES: Wait. I do.

6           MS. PENDERGRASS: All right. Doc --  
7 Dr. Sumchai and then -- okay.

8           MS. SUMCHAI: Yeah, first. Doctor, is it  
9 "shou" [phonetic]? Is that how you pronounce it?

10           I want to commend you on your methodology and  
11 thoroughness of the study.

12           I also wanted to commend the members of the RAB  
13 and the community who put pressure on the Health  
14 Department to have the study conducted.

15           I did want to preface my comment by -- by  
16 letting people know that I did, you know, practice in  
17 San Francisco hospitals for 15 years as a  
18 board-certified emergency physician.

19           And out of that expertise, I wanted to say that  
20 the Achilles heel of the study, in my opinion, is that  
21 you looked at asthma hospitalizations and not emergency  
22 department visits, because the trend in the health-care  
23 industry over the last decade has been to reduce overall  
24 hospital admissions.

25           Dr. Bhatia, I know that you work in the chest

1 clinic at the San Francisco General Hospital, and like  
2 me, I know you have seen severe asthmatics come in with  
3 O2 sats of 60 percent and elevated CO2, and it is  
4 defined as reversible bronchospasm. They are treated  
5 for, you know, 6, 8, sometimes 12 hours and then  
6 released from the emergency department.

7           So I agree with you that from the standpoint of  
8 asthma severity, that if someone has severe enough  
9 asthma to come into the emergency department and it was  
10 triggered by the landfill fire, that they should be  
11 admitted and that you should see that trend in hospital  
12 admissions.

13           But I do believe that the most accurate  
14 information that you would receive would have been  
15 information you would have gained from looking at  
16 overall emergency department visits, because the  
17 overwhelming majority of asthmatics, no matter how  
18 severe they are, are not going to be hospitalized.

19           And there may be a race factor in that also,  
20 you know. An African-American child or, you know, a  
21 Latino child may less likely be hospitalized for even a  
22 severe asthmatic attack, especially if they reverse  
23 themselves.

24           So I do think that that is the limitation of  
25 the study, and I think that that needs to be

1 incorporated in your conclusion.

2 MS. PENDERGRASS: If you have time to comment  
3 on that, and then -- and then we will move on to our  
4 next presentation.

5 DR. BHATIA: It's true that this was  
6 hospitalizations. I think that hospitalizations reflect  
7 the severe asthmatics. And so again, that's what we  
8 were able -- that's what we were able to look at.

9 Latinos and African-Americans are not  
10 hospitalized less in general for after -- for asthma.  
11 They are hospitalized more than others. So I think  
12 that's one difference.

13 If questions -- any further questions that  
14 are -- that you want to direct in writing, I think Amy,  
15 could you be a conduit for those questions for us? And  
16 we will -- that will be the best way to make sure that  
17 we get the questions and answers promptly back to you  
18 and the RAB.

19 MS. PENDERGRASS: All right. Thank you very  
20 much.

21 Okay. We're going to catch back up, and we  
22 have a presentation by Laurie Lowman, and do we need an  
23 introduction on that, or just want to jump right in?

24 MS. LOWMAN: You want to do an intro? Drum  
25 roll?

1 MR. FORMAN: No drum roll needed.

2 This is -- I believe I've been told that this  
3 is not the first time that Ms. Laurie Lowman has come to  
4 the RAB, and it certainly will not be the last time.  
5 She is with the Radiological Affairs Support Office for  
6 the Navy in Yorktown, Virginia. And she attended the  
7 subcommittee meeting with Dr. Sumchai hosting that last  
8 night.

9 And I think you had a very productive  
10 subcommittee meeting.

11 But she's here tonight to give you the  
12 presentation on radiological issues and where we are at  
13 on Hunters Point right now.

14 As I indicated, the draft final HRA, Historical  
15 Radiological Assessment, has been delayed; and  
16 Ms. Lowman is going to talk about that tonight and also  
17 outside of the HRA, which is just one document in the  
18 whole radiological issue, what are -- what are they and  
19 the contractor doing, and where are we in the project.

20 MS. LOWMAN: Thank you.

21 MR. FORMAN: Thank you.

22 MS. LOWMAN: Thank you very much.

23 It's nice to be here again. My husband and I  
24 have come from Virginia. That's where RASO, or  
25 Radiological Affairs Support Office, is located.

1 I am obviously Laurie Lowman, and I'm director  
2 of the Navy's low-level radioactive waste disposal  
3 program, and it is through that program that we're  
4 contracting for all the radiological actions out at  
5 Hunters Point.

6 The main topic that I'm here to cover today is  
7 the status of the Historical Radiological Assessment.  
8 As you know, we published a draft HRA on March 29th,  
9 2002. We received lots of comments, both -- some in --  
10 a lot in writing and some just general comments that we  
11 did not receive and were not documented and we did not  
12 respond to.

13 The comments we received during the time span  
14 of June to Septe- -- through September, excuse me, 2002  
15 from EPA, DHS, City of San Francisco, ATSDR, Lennar  
16 Developers, and also some concerned citizens. And  
17 earlier or rather late in 2002 it was announced that we  
18 would publish the draft final HRA in January of 2003.

19 We have decided to delay the publication of the  
20 final draft HRA. We have identified lots of new  
21 information. Part of that was identified during the  
22 preparation of the responses to comments. And we have  
23 identified significant inaccuracies in the document and  
24 in the references that were used in the document.

25 We feel that if we were try -- to try to meet



1 that January 2003 deadline, we would not produce a  
2 comprehensive and accurate document. And therefore, we  
3 have decided to go forth, do intensive study, and try to  
4 produce an accurate and comprehensive document that  
5 would truly bring forth all the radio -- radiological  
6 issues associated with Hunters Point.

7           To do that, we are going to be reviewing  
8 archives, and that includes archives at San Bruno. We  
9 are going to go back there again. We have found some  
10 new key words to search on.

11           We have also been told that DOE has recently  
12 declassified a large number of documents. We are also  
13 doing archive researches at the National Archives in  
14 D.C., at the DOE archives in Las Vegas.

15           We have some other government agencies doing  
16 work for us in their own archives, like the Defense  
17 Threat Reduction Agency that handles all the atomic  
18 veterans' claims from the atomic testing. They are  
19 doing research for us as well as some other Navy  
20 commands that have histories of NRDL work that was done  
21 and work that they did with them.

22           We are also doing visual inspections of the  
23 site and each of the impacted sites or any site at  
24 the -- at Hunters Point with a radiological history.  
25 And it helps us when we look at the history that we are

1 finding that is written, and we look at the actual  
2 buildings and visualize the structures and what could  
3 have occurred there.

4           We have brought additional personnel on to do  
5 research and analyze the historical information that we  
6 are finding. One of those is Bill Haney. He is here  
7 with New World Technology. We have got another  
8 gentleman from New World Technology. We have got actual  
9 Navy historians that are doing research archive work for  
10 us. There is a lot of additional personnel that will be  
11 working on this project.

12           One of the big things we have to do is  
13 completely digest all the related material, and that is  
14 a tremendous task.

15           One of the things we recently received is: A  
16 gentleman who was the leading scientist at Hunters Point  
17 at NRDL, actually, and before he died, he had been  
18 compiling a history at NRDL. We have received his  
19 personal papers. It's approximately five huge boxes of  
20 information; and to go through all of this information  
21 and all the details, every weekly bulletin published by  
22 NRDL, et cetera, is taking a great deal of time in tying  
23 everything together.

24           The other thing we are going to be doing, which  
25 I think you are going to be really happy about, is: We

1 are going to be conducting in-depth interviews with  
2 personnel with any knowledge of radiological operations  
3 at HPS.

4           We have an advertisement -- you can go to the  
5 next one, please -- that will be in the local papers --  
6 Keith has the exact list of papers -- that will be in  
7 the CHRONICLE, the EXAMINER, the BAYVIEW, the --

8           MR. FORMAN:   SUN REPORTER.

9           MS. LOWMAN:   -- the SUN REPORTER, and the  
10 SACRAMENTO BEE, 'cause we have been told a lot of the  
11 folks that retired from the Shipyard moved to the  
12 Sacramento area.

13           It will start this Sunday.  It has a 1-800  
14 call-in number.  And that's the number, 1-800-443-7164.  
15 The point of contact for the call-ins will be Daryl  
16 DeLong at New World Technology.  He is here today.  
17 There's his e-mail address.  He can also be contacted by  
18 e-mail.  And the interviews will be conducted by my  
19 husband, Dick Lowman, or by myself.

20           Next slide, please.

21           We will interview anyone who has knowledge of  
22 radiological operations at Hunters Point.  They could be  
23 NRDL former employees or people who knew former  
24 employees.  It could be Hunters Point Shipyard that also  
25 went by the name of San Francisco Naval Shipyard or San

1 Francisco Bay Naval Shipyard or workers from Triple A.

2           I've been having a really difficult time  
3 getting any type of records from Triple A and the work  
4 they did there. We know they did some work involving  
5 removal of radium dials and gauges from ships, and I'm  
6 just not finding any information on it. So if you know  
7 anyone that was associated with Triple A, in particular,  
8 that is one area I am really lacking.

9           We also will be interviewing, if we get  
10 contacted, former contractors that may have worked. We  
11 know there were contractors that came and did waste  
12 removal from Hunters Point Naval Shipyard, radioactive  
13 waste removal. There are all types of personnel that  
14 could have -- any type of personnel who was involved in  
15 any radiological or has knowledge of radiological  
16 operations at the yard.

17           Another thing we will be doing is contacting  
18 the personnel interviewed by and researchers used by  
19 Lisa Davis for her fallout articles. These interviews  
20 can be face-to-face interviews. We can go to the people  
21 that will be calling in if they cannot get to us. They  
22 can be telephonic interviews, or they can be e-mail  
23 interviews. Any way we can get the information we are  
24 happy to work with the interviewees.

25           The other issue is: We want to make sure

1 everybody understands that we want the interviewees to  
2 speak freely about any radiological operation. They  
3 should -- We are -- we are interested in obtaining all  
4 the information we can from the interviewees.

5           We are not interested in pursuing any legal  
6 action against any interviewee for improper handling,  
7 use, or disposal of radioactive material or disclosure  
8 of sensitive information.

9           Now, we have had previous interviewees. We had  
10 a couple say: "We don't know if we should tell you  
11 this. We are worried that," you know, "the government  
12 is going to come prosecute us that we did something  
13 wrong." We are not interested in that at all. We just  
14 want to find out what operations took place, what  
15 knowledge anybody may have with that. That's all we're  
16 looking for.

17           The other thing was: They were worried about  
18 disclosing classified information. We are not worried  
19 about that. We are looking at the general information  
20 that could be provided about any residual radiological  
21 contamination.

22           Now, the HRA is a very important document to  
23 the radiological clearance of Hunters Point; and I  
24 thought maybe if I explained that a little bit, that  
25 would help understand why we feel it is so important to

1 get this document accurate and comprehensive. It's the  
2 first step in our process.

3           If we don't know what the history is of  
4 radiological operations, we don't know where to start in  
5 doing any kind of survey or investigation. It's the  
6 history that leads us to the areas that we need to look  
7 at, where we need to survey, where we need to sample.  
8 And an HRA will determine the location of previous  
9 radiological operations. It will help us define what  
10 investigations we need to perform.

11           It's going to tell us what radioisotopes were  
12 used at what location. And that is very important so  
13 you know what type of survey instruments to use, what  
14 type of sample processing to do. And then it's from  
15 there that we can distinguish the type of surveys we  
16 need to do and whether or not we need to do any remedial  
17 actions.

18           And the radiological process always starts with  
19 an HRA. Unfortunately, at Hunters Point, it didn't, but  
20 that is because the HRA concept has really only come  
21 into play within the past ten years.

22           And these operations stopped. NRDL closed in  
23 1969. The Shipyard closed in 1974. So this is a new  
24 concept. It wasn't covered back then. They didn't  
25 provide a history of the site back then. So this is

1 something that we are kind of doing after the fact but  
2 that we need to do very badly.

3           And after the HRA, we take the information from  
4 the HRA, the historical information, that allows us to  
5 develop survey plans, to perform investigative surveys,  
6 identify and remove any contamination after which we  
7 perform the final status survey, which is the final  
8 survey you do to prove that that site has been  
9 remediated and is re- -- can be radiologically released.

10           At that point, we do our closeout action. We  
11 publish a formal report. The report goes to regulators  
12 in the city, DHS, EPA, whatever the concerned agencies  
13 are for their review and concurrence. And it's from  
14 that that we can publish the report and give it to the  
15 local community.

16           When is an HRA complete? Well, obviously, we  
17 can't keep adding information, or we'll never finish it.  
18 An HRA is an -- is an historical document. It is not a  
19 living document. We are going to document the history  
20 of the site in an HRA. We are not going to document  
21 ongoing action.

22           It's not going to include reports of the  
23 ongoing surveys. Those reports will be published  
24 separately after regulator review. It's very important  
25 that we understand that this document is going to have

1 the history of the site and not results of the ongoing  
2 surveys right now.

3           And a matter of fact, as we are obtaining  
4 different parts and pieces of history, those surveys  
5 that we're doing right now are changing. They may have  
6 a bigger emphasis. We might add new areas. It depends  
7 on what we're finding.

8           The emphasis will be absolutely on the accuracy  
9 and completeness of the document. That is what we want  
10 to have. We are going to take as long as we need to do  
11 it so that we can make sure we have found everything  
12 that we can find.

13           We can't determine a publication date right  
14 now. We don't know the extent of the interviews we will  
15 be conducting. We don't know the extent of the  
16 historical documents. Oftentimes one historical  
17 document may lead you to another one.

18           We do anticipate completing it. This is not a  
19 never-ending process. But we just can't give you a  
20 published -- publication date right now.

21           Now, we want to update you on a couple current  
22 radiological actions that we're working on, give you  
23 some updates, keep you informed.

24           The two in Parcel C that we are working on  
25 right now are Buildings 253 and 211. And in Parcel D,



1 we're working on the former Building 313 alpha site and  
2 the pier side parking area. It's down near the  
3 GundWalled area.

4           In Parcel C, if you can point this out, 253 is  
5 a big -- is the big tall glass building. Some people  
6 call it the periscope building. That was a new name for  
7 me. But it's very easily identifiable. It has six  
8 floors. Six? Correct.

9           We have found contamination on the roof of that  
10 building and on the fifth and sixth floors. There's  
11 some evidence that it was used as a radium dial painting  
12 facility. We are finding radium contamination as well  
13 as cesium contamination in that building.

14           We have recently -- Have we completed the  
15 remediation work, Daryl?

16           MR. DeLONG: Yes.

17           MS. LOWMAN: Yes, we have. And that was  
18 recently completed.

19           We are doing remediation of ventilation ducting  
20 that was -- ran from the paint boots and is contaminated  
21 with radium. That work is ongoing right now.

22           Building 211, which is adjacent to 253, has  
23 been used for storage of the radioactive waste bins when  
24 we do the remediations at the site. We are moving out  
25 of that location and going to store them in an area over

1 in Parcel E.

2           So we are doing the surveys in that building to  
3 release it from having stored our radioactive waste in  
4 that building, and those surveys are ongoing right now  
5 at this time.

6           On Parcel D, we are working at 313 alpha, which  
7 you can see. There it is right there. That was a  
8 former NRDL building. It has been demolished. I do not  
9 have the exact dates when it was demolished, and I'm not  
10 sure why it was demolished.

11           When we were doing the surveys of the building  
12 site, we found some contamination. And in remediating  
13 that contamination, we found an old manhole that was  
14 apparently under the building, and I have found maps  
15 since that time that indicate it was under the building.

16           It was filled with water. It was not in use.  
17 The water was stagnant and it is contaminated. We are  
18 removing that, the manhole, and working on that project  
19 right now.

20           It is c- -- cesium-137 contamination. And we  
21 will be able to tell if there's any remaining lines tied  
22 into that. If they are left tied in, they went to a  
23 drain field, and we are still investigating that. We  
24 won't be able to tell that until we actually remove the  
25 manhole.

1           The other area is right there. We found that  
2 area on a 1951 map. It appears now like it was a  
3 parking lot. But on the map, it's just shaded in a  
4 pretty pink color and says, "NRDL."

5           We started doing surveys out there. We are not  
6 exactly sure what they used it for, and it appears to  
7 have been fenced, and I'm guessing maybe they used it  
8 when they were taking parts and pieces off of the  
9 OPERATION CROSSROADS ships. But I'm not sure. I'm  
10 still looking for more information on that.

11           We did find cesium-137 contamination there.  
12 The remediation is complete, and the final status  
13 surveys are complete in that area.

14           Completed radiological actions to date that  
15 have passed all the scrutiny of the regulators right now  
16 are both in Parcel A. They are Building 821 and  
17 Building 816.

18           They are identified there on this location.  
19 Building 816 was the Van de Graaff facility, and it was  
20 approved for radiological release some time ago by DHS.  
21 That was our first building that was actually approved.

22           Building 821 was an x-ray facility. We have no  
23 history of any use of radiological materials in that  
24 building. I cannot find any documentation that  
25 radioactive material was ever used in that building. It

1 was an x-ray facility only.

2           And -- but we did find some evidence that it  
3 was used for storage, and we are not exactly sure what  
4 was stored in there. So we went ahead and did  
5 comprehensive surveys and sampling in that building. We  
6 found no contamination in that building.

7           And we have since that time published a report.  
8 It has gone to Department of Health Services; and in  
9 late November, they concurred with radiological release  
10 of that site. So that one has been approved for  
11 turnover by the Department of Health Services with the  
12 State of California.

13           That is actually a picture of Building 816 and  
14 Building 821.

15           Future -- We are going to continue with our  
16 ongoing remedial actions and surveys, and we're going to  
17 continue working on the HRA.

18           The HRA is definitely one of the Navy's highest  
19 priorities. It is receiving a lot of attention and as  
20 are the ongoing radiological remedial actions and  
21 surveys that we are doing out at Hunters Point. Those  
22 will continue as money is brought forward for that  
23 purpose, and we will keep working on them this year and  
24 try to keep you updated.

25           MS. PENDERGRASS: Thank you.

1 MS. LOWMAN: Now, questions?

2 (Applause.)

3 MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay.

4 MS. LOWMAN: Thank you very much.

5 MR. BROWN: Right on.

6 MS. PENDERGRASS: We have three questions here

7 and then four. Okay?

8 So with you, Miss Oliv- -- Oliva.

9 MS. OLIVA: Thank you. Thank you very much.

10 But I have a question for Don with San Francisco

11 Redevelopment.

12 Because the HRA is incomplete, isn't accurate,

13 and it won't be completed for we are not sure --

14 MS. LOWMAN: We are not sure. I would say

15 sometime late this year.

16 MS. OLIVA: -- how can Redevelopment submit a

17 conveyance for Parcel A and B to construct and build on

18 it? Especially when I just checked with Rhea on

19 radioactivity, cer- -- certain radioisotopes break down

20 into gases, which are radon. They -- Those things do

21 not know barriers. They don't know where Parcel A is or

22 E or C.

23 So I would like you to answer that question for

24 me based on what Miss Raso -- what RASO said about the

25 delay in all of this and what they are finding. Thank

1 you.

2           MR. CAPOBRES: I'll attempt to answer that  
3 question. The premise that we have on the development  
4 side, the re- -- reuse side, is that no new  
5 development can occur until the proper regulators sign  
6 off that it's safe to do so. That's the underlying  
7 premise.

8           We're continuing with our planning efforts on  
9 the developments that we have. We have got to keep that  
10 ball moving.

11           But new construction, new development doesn't  
12 occur until the regulators sign off on it, and that's  
13 all I can say.

14           The Navy conveyance agreement that we have put  
15 forth in public review at the Hunters Point Shipyard TAC  
16 and various other organizations outlines a process for  
17 transfer. It doesn't -- you know, it outlines kind of  
18 the steps that we take to transfer property.

19           Parcel A would be the first piece of property  
20 that would come, but there's nothing that's been  
21 approved yet that s- -- that says properties are going  
22 to transfer on X date. I mean, it's still subject to  
23 sign-off by the policy makers in the city, the  
24 Redevelopment Agency Commission, and we are still  
25 undergoing public review of that -- of that process.

1 MS. OLIVA: Since a building was found on  
2 Parcel A, even though they said that it -- that it's  
3 been remediated -- I believe that's what you said.

4 MS. LOWMAN: I'm sorry?

5 MS. OLIVA: With Parcel A, there's a building  
6 that was --

7 MS. LOWMAN: There were two buildings on  
8 Parcel A that we have concerns with, and we have  
9 surveyed those, and those have met the standards of the  
10 California Department of Health Services. We didn't  
11 find contamination in 821. But years ago 816 had been  
12 remediated, and it meets today's standards.

13 MS. OLIVA: But re- -- radioactivity never goes  
14 away. It has a life span of thousands of years.

15 MS. LOWMAN: Well, it depends on which  
16 radioisotope you are talking about. But some of them  
17 have --

18 MS. OLIVA: I was asking you --

19 MS. LOWMAN: -- half-lives of millions of  
20 years.

21 MS. OLIVA: Have those isotopes been determined  
22 on those two buildings?

23 MS. LOWMAN: Building 821 had no actual history  
24 of any use of radioactive material in it.

25 MS. OLIVA: So you found no radioisotopes?

1 MS. LOWMAN: No, we did not, no.

2 And Building 816 was used for the Van de Graaff  
3 accelerator. The main contaminant there was tritium and  
4 the tritium targets; and that was remediated, and the  
5 building was clean some years ago.

6 MS. OLIVA: Tritium?

7 MS. LOWMAN: Tritium, hydrogen 3.

8 MS. SUMCHAI: Well, my understanding was that  
9 there was cesium-137, and it was below the EPA's  
10 investigation remediation levels, or am I confused about  
11 that? I mean, is it accurate to say that there was no  
12 contamination?

13 MS. LOWMAN: It is accurate to say there was no  
14 contamination.

15 Originally there was one sample that came up  
16 with some elevated levels of cesium, but it was not run  
17 in the proper geometry. When we sent it out to an  
18 independent laboratory for confirmation, they ran it  
19 properly. In the proper geometry, there was no cesium.

20 Our release limit for cesium is .1 picocuries  
21 per gram. The original sample came up is .14 picocuries  
22 per gram. And when we ran it in an outside laboratory,  
23 it came up at .08 picocuries per gram.

24 MS. SUMCHAI: So it was there. It was just  
25 below the level?



1 MS. LOWMAN: It was -- No, it was not there.  
2 It was that we did not run the sample in the proper  
3 geometry.  
4 MS. SUMCHAI: It would have been zero if it was  
5 not there. Even if it comes out at an infinitesimal  
6 amount --  
7 MS. LOWMAN: Well, yes, you could say that.  
8 But there's cesium everywhere. It's a fallout factor.  
9 MS. PENDERGRASS: Miss Rines?  
10 MS. RINES: I just wanted to say thank you for  
11 your presentation and the fact that you're going to  
12 spend more time doing this.  
13 Was there a draft of the HRA?  
14 MS. LOWMAN: Mm-hmm.  
15 MS. RINES: Okay. Is there going to be  
16 anything between? You're saying you estimate possibly  
17 till the end of this year?  
18 MS. LOWMAN: I said before the end of the year.  
19 MS. RINES: Okay. Would you put out a draft  
20 between that time?  
21 MS. LOWMAN: No. No.  
22 MS. RINES: Okay.  
23 MS. LOWMAN: We will not. It will -- it will  
24 take a great deal of effort, and my time is being  
25 devoted almost 100 percent just working on the HRA with

1 the team members, and it will be a massive effort just  
2 to get another draft prepared.

3 MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay.

4 Mr. Campbell?

5 MR. CAMPBELL: Laurie, thank you very much for  
6 your forthrightness on -- on this presentation.

7 We were working with a gentleman. His name is  
8 Tom Olson. He worked for Triple A Shipyards.

9 MS. LOWMAN: Okay.

10 MR. CAMPBELL: We did -- We sent a team to  
11 videotape him in New Mexico while he was there. He had  
12 a lot of information on NRDL because he was asked to do  
13 certain types of dumping.

14 MS. LOWMAN: Okay.

15 MR. CAMPBELL: And on this dumping, they ran  
16 across something one night, and they were requested to  
17 sign a secrecy agreement.

18 We worked with some whistle-blower agencies  
19 trying to help him so we can have this information  
20 released on what actually was in the Shipyard and what's  
21 in there.

22 Would this agreement that you're putting forth  
23 cover somebody like him? Because we'd be happy to give  
24 you, one, the videotapes. And he's been on the radio,  
25 and we have had him on television.

1 MS. LOWMAN: I --

2 MR. CAMPBELL: And -- and other people have

3 spoken to him, and we don't think it's fair that he's

4 locked up with a secrecy agreement at this point.

5 MS. LOWMAN: I do not know of -- To date I

6 have not found any secrecy agreement-type issues, and we

7 are -- and certainly, Dick and I both have the

8 clearances that we can talk with him --

9 MR. CAMPBELL: Excellent.

10 MS. LOWMAN: -- about anything that he may have

11 experienced, and we would be happy to talk with him or

12 view the videotapes or do anything. We -- Both Dick

13 and I have clearances, and we work with people if they

14 feel they have security issues involved.

15 MR. CAMPBELL: Thank you.

16 MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay. Miss Asher will be the

17 last question, and we'll move to --

18 MS. OLIVA: I -- I just want to thank you for

19 your forthright presentation. It's very refreshing.

20 And it's not what we usually get, and I appreciate it.

21 Thank you.

22 MS. PENDERGRASS: All right. Thank you very

23 much.

24 (Applause.)

25 MR. TOMPKINS: For clarity --

1 MS. PENDERGRASS: Mr. Tompkins?

2 MR. TOMPKINS: Point of clarification for me.

3 I want to make sure I understood.

4 Therefore, until your report, until you guys

5 put the --

6 MR. FORMAN: Draft final.

7 MR. TOMPKINS: -- draft final together, no

8 property whatsoever, Parcel A, B, or anything else will

9 be -- any conveyance will take place until your complete

10 total document is ready?

11 MS. LOWMAN: That is not -- I mean --

12 MR. FORMAN: That's me.

13 MS. LOWMAN: That's for Keith to answer.

14 MR. TOMPKINS: I need to know where --

15 MS. LOWMAN: Yeah, Keith needs to answer that.

16 MR. TOMPKINS: Thank you.

17 MR. FORMAN: All right. All right.

18 The question is, we're on the draft HRA. We're

19 a ways away from ever being able to issue the draft

20 final HRA, which is what we need to do, and that's been

21 in writing before -- I guess you just want me to

22 reiterate that, which is fine.

23 The draft final HRA needs to come out -- the

24 accurate and comprehensive version she was talking about

25 needs to come out before you can convey property, you're

1 right. It is one of the things that we need to do  
2 before this --

3 MR. TOMPKINS: So "A" through -- "A" through  
4 "E," nothing happens until this is completed?

5 MR. FORMAN: Correc- -- Right. No conveyance  
6 of any parcel until we get the Historical Radiological  
7 Assessment out.

8 MR. TOMPKINS: Okay. Thank you.

9 MR. BROWN: Bam.

10 MR. TOMPKINS: That's all I need to hear.

11 MR. BROWN: Bam.

12 MS. PENDERGRASS: Thank you.

13 All right. Yes, ma'am?

14 MS. LUTTON: Laurie, I -- you said that  
15 recently some documents were declassified, and that's  
16 what gave you a breakthrough of lots more information.

17 I'm curious. Does that mean there are no more  
18 classified documents on the shipyards remaining?

19 MS. LOWMAN: The Shipyard itself and NRDL, I  
20 have not seen classified documents for the Shipyard.  
21 Classified documents we are aware of have to do with the  
22 Navy Radiological Defense Laboratory or the Radiation  
23 Safety Section and OPERATION CROSSROADS that was part of  
24 the Shipyard.

25 Now, anytime there is a document that has

1 specific information about the testing of an atomic  
2 weapon or a nuclear weapon, as they were called later,  
3 and it could provide design information, oftentimes that  
4 is still classified or called formerly restricted data  
5 or restricted data.

6           That is the only things we have seen have been  
7 classified documents that had to do with the work NRDL  
8 personnel did at the weapons test sites, not work that  
9 they did at NRDL.

10           So the new documents that have been  
11 declassified, I haven't looked at them yet. There are  
12 still some classified documents, but we haven't located  
13 any that have to do with any operations that occurred at  
14 the Shipyard itself.

15           MS. PENDERGRASS: All right. Thank you so much  
16 for that.

17           MS. LOWMAN: Does that help? Yeah.

18           MS. LUTTON: So there -- I'm still not clear.  
19 There are no more classified documents having to do with  
20 things that happened at the Shipyard?

21           MS. LOWMAN: Not that I have found.

22           MS. PENDERGRASS: Thank you.

23           MS. LUTTON: But it's an unknown?

24           MS. LOWMAN: Well, we are still looking.

25           MS. LUTTON: Okay.

1 MS. LOWMAN: So I hesitate to make any complete  
2 blanket statement.

3 MS. LUTTON: Okay. Thank you.

4 MS. LOWMAN: Okay.

5 MS. PENDERGRASS: All right. Can we move to  
6 subcommittee reports? And kind of get back on schedule.

7 Mr. Mason, do you have a report from your  
8 meeting?

9 MR. MASON: Yes, yes, I do, the meeting that we  
10 had January 16th. We had -- we had canceled the January  
11 10th meeting and put it off till January 16th.

12 The committee was concerned about certain  
13 things that the community would like to have looked at.  
14 You know, we were concerned about some community's space  
15 for some of the truckers in there, you know. We were  
16 concerned about businesses that -- that the community  
17 can have on the Shipyard.

18 And it's not written up because I haven't had  
19 an opportunity to get on a computer yet. But I just  
20 want to get this into the record.

21 We are concerned about -- we -- we are  
22 concerned about potential space for the community  
23 truckers, you know, areas of community business  
24 participation, you know, prime contractors for community  
25 resources, a list of all local contractors doing

1 business with the community, list of all business --  
2 list of all employees, list all community residents  
3 working in the Shipyard, local 94124, mentorship  
4 programs, you know.

5           We're looking -- We are talking about the Navy  
6 mentoring contractors like they did with Mendelian  
7 Construction and some other construction companies  
8 that -- that they have working on the Shipyard. We are  
9 concerned about those.

10           Areas of concern that we are -- about the  
11 metals that we are talking about with the base  
12 commander. The agenda was that we were concerned about  
13 the salvage metals, you know, how clean is it, the  
14 location of the metals, the exporting of the metals, you  
15 know, how much of the metals.

16           Are you willing to show us -- give us a tour of  
17 where those metals are?

18           The grades, if the metal was cont- -- un- --  
19 uncontaminated. You know, those are things that we are  
20 concerned with, you know, with the base commander. So  
21 these are concerns that we have.

22           But we're also concerned with the economic  
23 situation as opposed to how much the community's making  
24 and the other outside contractors. We know that the  
25 community is probably relatively making 1 percent, and



1 that's just not enough, you know. We are concerned with  
2 more opportunities for the community in those areas.

3           So we are having another economic meeting on  
4 the -- the 12th of February, I think that is.

5           The 12th of February?

6           MS. PENDERGRASS: Yes, it is, at 3:30.

7           MR. MASON: At -- at 3:30 at BDI. And I would  
8 like for all those that are concerned about our economic  
9 situation to come to that meeting; and if they have  
10 some -- have some questions, they ask those that are --  
11 that -- that are there.

12           And we like to invite Keith and Dave DeMars and  
13 the base commander at that meeting.

14           MR. FORMAN: Okay.

15           MR. MASON: But we also have some concern,  
16 Keith, about the fact that we invited Foster Wheeler and  
17 some other contractors from the community to come and  
18 give us a presentation on what they are doing in -- in  
19 the Shipyard. And Foster Wheeler's not here, and  
20 Mendelian and Marinship is not here.

21           We know that I.T.S.I. is back in the Shipyard,  
22 and we are looking forward to some good things happening  
23 with them again.

24           But, you know, we -- we are concerned about  
25 those companies that -- that are invading us because

1 they're -- they're not dealing with us directly.

2 Foster Wheeler has a contract. They put out a  
3 contract for two days. They wanted a bid in two days,  
4 you know; and this is kind of strange, you know. You  
5 need to give our -- our companies -- our contractors  
6 time to bid on such situations, you know, because we are  
7 not as, you know, expert as a lot of the other  
8 contractors or a lot of the other --

9 MR. FORMAN: Who won that contract? Who won  
10 that contract?

11 MR. MASON: I -- I don't know. I'm under the  
12 impression that -- that there was 5,000 tons of Class 1  
13 contamination going -- going out of the Shipyard. But  
14 that was a two-day process, you know.

15 And I had called Glenn Star, and he had called  
16 me back. But we have been playing phone tag; and, you  
17 know, I would like to find out about why they putting  
18 out contracts, you know, proposals for two days to get  
19 back to them, you know. So --

20 MS. PENDERGRASS: Mr. Mason, can I just  
21 interrupt you for just a moment? I mean, I really -- we  
22 need to urge you --

23 MR. BROWN: Right.

24 MS. PENDERGRASS: -- strongly to try to get  
25 your report into something that you can share with the

1 group and to -- at this point when you're making your  
2 presentation to bring either recommendation or something  
3 that the Board would vote on, an action at this point.

4 MR. MASON: I agree with you. Normally we  
5 would bring those recommendations to the table. But,  
6 you know, like I said, access to a computer has been  
7 kind of difficult. So I plan to have this written up  
8 and sent to --

9 MS. PENDERGRASS: Mr. Keichline?

10 MR. MASON: -- Mr. Keichline, you know. So --

11 MS. PENDERGRASS: Ron, is there any support  
12 that you can give to Mr. Mason in that regard in terms  
13 of this report?

14 MR. KEICHLINE: I'd have to look into that and  
15 get back to you.

16 MR. MASON: I -- I have access, but I just  
17 haven't -- you know, I've been --

18 MS. PENDERGRASS: You might wait and talk with  
19 him about those times that you don't.

20 MR. MASON: I've been on the hiatus myself. So  
21 that -- that's basically my report.

22 MS. PENDERGRASS: All right. Very fine. Thank  
23 you.

24 Radiological issues?

25 MS. SUMCHAI: I -- I have a very, very brief

1 report. I wanted to -- to --

2 MS. PENDERGRASS: And you do have minutes on  
3 the back -- your report?

4 MS. SUMCHAI: -- yesterday. I have some  
5 hand-completed minutes in e-mail format. I hope to get  
6 those out to you by the weekend. They closely parallel  
7 Laurie Lowman's presentation. So most of what we talked  
8 about yesterday she's already presented.

9 I did want to acknowledge the passing of  
10 Dr. Arthur Coleman. Dr. Coleman had agreed to  
11 participate as a member of the Radiological  
12 Subcommittee, and he had actually planned to attend the  
13 August 15th meeting and did propose that the  
14 subcommittee meet at Bayview HERC. So his loss is a  
15 tremendous one, not only for the RAB, but for the entire  
16 community.

17 I think that at this point, one of the best  
18 things that the RAB can do and the Radiological  
19 Subcommittee can do is to support Keith Forman in his  
20 recommendation that we all work actively to help  
21 identify people who have knowledge of radiological  
22 operations at the base.

23 And Maurice, I did turn over to Laurie Lowman  
24 Tom Olson's number, and those of you who can help in  
25 that regard will be very important.

1           So at the next meeting that I hope we have in  
2 March, the fourth Wednesday in March, the 26th, from  
3 3:00 to 5:00 at LEJ, perhaps we could focus on bringing  
4 together a cadre of people who are willing to work in an  
5 active manner to assist the Navy in identifying people  
6 to make the HRA the most complete and comprehensive  
7 document possible.

8           So I will get the meeting summary out to you.

9           MS. PENDERGRASS: Thank you.

10          MS. BUSHNELL: I -- I just want to comment.  
11 I -- I'm sort of disturbed at all these subcommittee  
12 meetings that are occurring at 4:00 and 5:00 in the  
13 afternoon. I mean, I work, and I can't attend anything  
14 that occurs before that. And I really think it's -- it  
15 would be nice if somehow you could arrange that they  
16 would be later, a little bit later in the evening.

17          MS. SUMCHAI: I cannot do that. I adjusted my  
18 own work schedule too many times -- I adjusted my work  
19 schedule two evenings in a row, you know, for the RAB  
20 and for the Radiological Subcommittee.

21          The opportune time that we have had the best  
22 attended meeting was August 15th, which was a evening  
23 meeting. Yesterday's meeting was very, very well  
24 attended. We have had morning meetings that have not  
25 been as well attended.

1           But, you know, I also have a life that we have  
2 to respect. But I am willing to be flexible, and I'm  
3 willing to experiment with times and offer the best  
4 available for everyone.

5           MS. PENDERGRASS: That's the best we can ask  
6 for.

7           Technical review?

8           MS. LOIZOS: I don't have much of a report. I  
9 apologize. In looking through the meeting minutes, I  
10 guess there was a meeting scheduled for the 21st of this  
11 month, but there was a little bit of miscommunication in  
12 the office, and I didn't show up for that meeting, nor  
13 did Chris. So I hope nobody else did.

14          MR. BROWN: Who are you?

15          MS. PENDERGRASS: She introduced herself. You  
16 weren't listening.

17          MS. LOIZOS: I introduced myself at the  
18 beginning of the meeting.

19          MR. BROWN: Who are you?

20          MS. LOIZOS: I'm not Christine Shirley. My  
21 name is a Lea Loizos. I also work for Arc Ecology.

22          And since Lynne brought it up, I guess I will  
23 mention that, unfortunately, Christine doesn't work at  
24 Arc anymore. Her last week was last week. Hence, all  
25 the miscommunication within the office.

1           So that's why I'm filling in for her today, and  
2 I'm hoping that through applying into the RAB, I will be  
3 a permanent seat on the RAB for Arc Ecology.

4           And our next meeting is on February 19th. I  
5 hope that we will be talking about the risk management  
6 review process for Parcel B. And yeah, I hope you are  
7 all there and get a chance to know me a little bit  
8 better.

9           MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay. I -- I would like to  
10 just make sure that you understand the process. So have  
11 you talked with Lynne about that process?

12          Okay. Perfect. Just want to make sure. So we  
13 can move that along.

14          MR. KEICHLINE: Question.

15          MS. PENDERGRASS: Yes, sir.

16          MR. KEICHLINE: I have a point of clarification  
17 that relates to the Technical Review Committee --

18          MS. PENDERGRASS: Yes, sir.

19          MR. KEICHLINE: -- specifically the motion that  
20 Ms. Bushnell made earlier in the meeting stating that  
21 the minutes should be corrected to reflect that the  
22 subcommittee met on November the 13th.

23          I've reviewed the transcript, and Miss Shirley  
24 does say, "November 19th." So that correction won't be  
25 made. But if you'd like that put in these minutes as a

1 clarification or a notation, I could do that.

2 MS. BUSHNELL: Yeah, that will be fine. Thank  
3 you.

4 MS. PENDERGRASS: Thank you.

5 The risk review and health?

6 MS. PIERCE: There is no report. We did not  
7 have a meeting since -- since last month. The next  
8 meeting will be on February 13th at 6 p.m. at 5021 Third  
9 Street. That's the --

10 MS. PENDERGRASS: February 13th --

11 MS. PIERCE: -- Bayview Advocates office.

12 MS. PENDERGRASS: -- at what time?

13 MS. PIERCE: Six p.m.

14 MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay. At where?

15 MS. PIERCE: That's a Thursday.

16 5021 Third Street.

17 MR. MASON: You said 16th.

18 MS. PIERCE: Thirteenth.

19 MR. ATTENDEE: She said, "13th."

20 MS. PIERCE: Thursday, the 13th.

21 MR. MASON: Sorry.

22 MS. PIERCE: Hello.

23 MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay. 50- --

24 MS. PIERCE: -- -21 --

25 MS. PENDERGRASS: -- Third Street?



1 MS. PIERCE: Yes.

2 MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay. Got it.

3 Okay. Next report and final report would be

4 bylaws and subcommittee. I'm sorry. Bylaws &

5 Membership.

6 MS. OLIVA: He's not here.

7 MS. PENDERGRASS: Miss Rines.

8 MS. RINES: We -- I gave notes. We had a very

9 quick meeting. It consisted of myself, Keith, and

10 Dorothy.

11 What we want to do is bring it up for a final

12 vote by the RAB, a full board, on adjusting the bylaws,

13 amending them about the attendance.

14 Ron is passing out these bylaws again. It was

15 the last revised one in December.

16 All we changed was the attendance, stating that

17 "All RAB members are expected to attend regular

18 meetings." If any member's absent from the four

19 meetings in a calendar year, he or she will be

20 automatically removed. There will be no distinction

21 between excused and unexcused.

22 And each member has an alt- -- can designate an

23 alternate, but the alternate has the privileges of the

24 member but does not count towards attendance. Okay?

25 Your alternate is not you. So it is not your

1 attendance. If your alternate is there, you are absent.  
2 Okay? That's how we have to do this.

3 And then the other thing we wanted to change  
4 is: We wanted to add three community organizations to  
5 have permanent seats. The third one is the  
6 Bayview-Hunters Point Project Area Committee as -- we  
7 also have the Citizens Advisory Committee and the  
8 Technical Assistance Grant.

9 That is all we are changing. We need to bring  
10 this to a vote now because it's January. We need to  
11 start this year out, like, right.

12 MS. PENDERGRASS: Does --? Has everybody had a  
13 chance to review --

14 MS. RINES: Yes.

15 MS. PENDERGRASS: -- the bylaws?

16 MS. RINES: This was handed out in November and  
17 in December.

18 MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay. Is there --?

19 Are you proposing a motion --

20 MS. RINES: Yes.

21 MS. PENDERGRASS: -- to accept the bylaws --

22 MS. RINES: That's what I'm doing now.

23 MS. PENDERGRASS: -- dated --?

24 MS. RINES: Read it to everyone --

25 MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay. Was it --?

1 MS. RINES: -- so they could see.

2 MS. PENDERGRASS: Ron, when are those bylaws  
3 dated?

4 MR. KEICHLINE: December 5th.

5 MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay.

6 So there's a motion on the floor to accept the  
7 bylaws dated December 5th as -- as our bylaws for this  
8 body.

9 Do I hear a second?

10 MS. ASHER: I second it.

11 MS. FRANKLIN: Question.

12 MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay. Discussion? Miss  
13 Franklin?

14 MS. FRANKLIN: I -- I -- I want to address --  
15 I'm Marie Franklin. I want to address the alternate --  
16 I would like to address the alternate policy that has  
17 been in the minutes. To me, to select an alternate and  
18 not have an alternate supply your activities here, you  
19 know, in other words, count, I think it's privilege  
20 lost.

21 So I think I would like to say that we strike  
22 that and allow alternate to count as an attendance is  
23 what the alternate is selected for. Thank you.

24 MS. PENDERGRASS: Discussion for that -- for  
25 that -- for the purpose of discussion of that item,

1 addition or deletion should have been directed towards  
2 the subcommittee and during the period of review since  
3 the last meeting. At this point, the discussion is --  
4 is just clarification because the question will be  
5 asked.

6           So I'm not trying to discount what you're  
7 asking. But at this point, this is not the place of  
8 discussion for that.

9           MS. FRANKLIN: Well, no. Madam Chair, last  
10 time they defer -- they deferred the matter totally in  
11 December. So there was no room.

12          MS. PENDERGRASS: No, no.

13          MS. RINES: But we did actually discuss it.  
14 It's -- This is the third time we have had to bring  
15 this up.

16          We -- we revised them in -- I don't know what  
17 it was -- in, like, October where we were going to say  
18 the alternate was -- could take the place and it would  
19 count and how many, how many absences you can have.

20          And then we went again and we brought it before  
21 the RAB, and they said no. We went back, did it again.  
22 We came up with this policy. They -- You guys said no.  
23 We brought it back, and this is the last time.

24          And we have had the RAB -- we had the bylaws  
25 meeting, and people have not shown. And we tried to do

1 in the evening, and we wait, and we're at the library.

2 But this is what we have been trying to discuss.

3 I mean, I understand the -- the point of having  
4 the alternate is to pick up the information because  
5 everybody has that responsibility, that it's a big one  
6 to show up; and it's four times if you miss in a  
7 calendar year you will be removed. But, I mean, we know  
8 people have other things to do, but four times is not --  
9 that's a -- that's a lot -- that's a quarter of a year.

10 MS. SUMCHAI: Yeah.

11 MS. PENDERGRASS: Mr. Tompkins, do you have  
12 something to add to -- add to the discussion --

13 MR. TOMPKINS: Yes.

14 MS. PENDERGRASS: -- regarding this motion?

15 MR. TOMPKINS: Just a discussion. People  
16 disagree; we then vote it down.

17 MS. PENDERGRASS: Exactly. Thank you.

18 MR. TOMPKINS: Yes or no and that's it.

19 MS. PENDERGRASS: Did you have a --?

20 MS. PIERCE: I'm just a little confused about  
21 what the current policy is. We seem to be going round  
22 and round.

23 So what is the current --? What do the bylaws  
24 say currently about absences and the use of alternates?

25 MR. KEICHLINE: It doesn't specify.

1 MS. RINES: It doesn't specify.

2 MS. ATTENDEE: Okay.

3 MS. PETERSON: Yes, it does. Yes, it -- yes,  
4 it does. Yes, it does. It says that you may -- oops.

5 MS. PENDERGRASS: Yes, ma'am. Go right ahead,  
6 Miss Peterson.

7 MS. PETERSON: It says that you can have four  
8 excused absences with the alternate counting as no  
9 excuse. In other words, the a- -- In other words, if  
10 the alternate shows up four times, you are considered  
11 present four times.

12 But there's a loophole big enough to drive a  
13 semi through, because, you know, people are just --  
14 they're abusing that. They are not showing up. And we  
15 were trying to make it easy for people not to be counted  
16 absent with an alternate.

17 Still the alternate has all the privileges of  
18 the person, of the member, but there are no excused  
19 absences because of the abuses. We have people who  
20 haven't even shown up.

21 MS. PENDERGRASS: Just for point of clarity,  
22 I'll read to you your accepted adopted, which were in  
23 '96 or revised in March of 2002.

24 Your attendance policy says:

25 All RAB members are expected to

1 attend regular meetings. Each member may  
2 designate an alternate to attend in his or her  
3 place. If any member or his or her alternate  
4 is absent from four meetings in a calendar year  
5 he or she may be automatically removed from the  
6 RAB.

7 There is "no distinction between excused and  
8 unexcused absences." So there -- but is silent in terms  
9 of anything outside of what the alternate can't do, but  
10 this makes the assumption that the alternate could act  
11 in the -- in the place of the designated member. So  
12 this is definitely a change to the policy.

13 So I think that if there's more discussion  
14 necessary on that, you know, we have to vote that down.

15 We still have an open motion on the floor.

16 MS. ASHER: Yeah. I -- I want to say there's a  
17 motion on the floor, and I second it, and I would like  
18 to take a vote on it right now.

19 MS. PENDERGRASS: Thank you. All in --

20 THE REPORTER: I need to change paper.

21 MS. PENDERGRASS: Yes, ma'am.

22 (Reporter's steno paper is refilled.)

23 MS. PENDERGRASS: All in -- The motion is --  
24 let's just put that out there one more time.

25 Can we just clarify the motion, Miss Rines?

1 Make sure you restate the motion.

2           The motion is -- the -- the motion is to accept  
3 the bylaws that are dated December 5th in their  
4 entirety?

5           MS. RINES: Yes.

6           MS. PENDERGRASS: We have had a second on that  
7 motion. All in favor say, "Aye."

8           THE BOARD: Aye.

9           MS. PENDERGRASS: Those opposed?

10          MR. TOMPKINS: Nay. I'm opposed.

11          MS. FRANKLIN: Opposed.

12          MS. PENDERGRASS: One opposed -- Two opposed.

13          MR. RAB MEMBER: Three.

14          MS. PENDERGRASS: Three opposed.

15          Any abstentions?

16          All right. The ayes clearly have that. So we  
17 do have new bylaws for this group dated December 5th,  
18 and those will be your operating bylaws from this day  
19 forward.

20                   (Applause.)

21          MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay.

22          MR. BROWN: The RAB members and the community  
23 members have two cards for Dick Lowman here, and I'd  
24 like to present it to him now.

25          MS. PETERSON: Stand up, Mr. Lowman.



1 MR. BROWN: Speech.

2 MR. FORMAN: Good job.

3 MR. BROWN: Right.

4 MS. PENDERGRASS: All right. This is a rare  
5 time when we have -- no. This is a rare time. This is  
6 a rare time that we do have opportunity for some  
7 comments or questions from the audience at this point.

8 MS. BUSHNELL: I have one more thing. Sorry.  
9 One more thing.

10 MS. PENDERGRASS: Yes, ma'am.

11 MS. BUSHNELL: This has to do, I guess, is  
12 Chris --? Do you know, is Chris resigning from the RAB  
13 board?

14 MS. BROWNELL: She is gone.

15 MS. PETERSON: She has to if she --

16 MS. PENDERGRASS: She doesn't have to resign  
17 from the Board, but she has to give up her seat from Arc  
18 Ecology, from what I understand.

19 MS. LOIZOS: Yeah, I don't believe she'll be  
20 sitting on the RAB any longer.

21 MS. BUSHNELL: Then that brings up the problem  
22 of subcommittee -- the subcommittee chair, then, must be  
23 a RAB representative. That's in the bylaws.

24 MS. PENDERGRASS: Yes, sir.

25 MR. FORMAN: Yes. We discussed that. She was

1 at Dr. Sumchai's subcommittee meeting last night, and we  
2 did discuss that; and I have said the same thing, that  
3 Chris is not Arc -- an Arc Ecology rep anymore, and  
4 she's resigning from the RAB.

5           So sh- -- Lea will have to submit an  
6 application and be voted in as a RAB member. I was  
7 ho- -- well, I'm not quite sure what the time frame for  
8 that would be.

9           MS. LOIZOS: I -- I started filling out the  
10 application already this evening. I could --

11          MR. FORMAN: Okay.

12          MS. LOIZOS: -- complete it before I leave.

13          MR. FORMAN: Okay. I'm not quite sure if --

14          MS. PENDERGRASS: What that means is: There  
15 needs to be a stand-in in that committee in terms of the  
16 chair.

17          MR. FORMAN: Until she's voted in.

18          MS. PENDERGRASS: Until she's voted in.

19          MR. FORMAN: Okay.

20          MS. PENDERGRASS: So is anybody willing to take  
21 that -- take that on?

22          MS. BUSHNELL: I will do it.

23          MS. PETERSON: At least it will be at night.

24          MS. PENDERGRASS: Mr. Campbell, do you have a  
25 problem with conceding that to Miss Bushnell or --?

1 MR. CAMPBELL: No, not at all.

2 MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay. All right. Yes, sir.

3 MR. CAMPBELL: I do have one point. The  
4 questions that we submitted, I was looking for a  
5 specific answer, "Additional Questions and Answers from  
6 Hunters Point Shipyard RAB Open Forum December 5th,  
7 2002."

8 Question submitted: "How much money in  
9 contracts has been awarded to the local community?"

10 Well, one thing is, we went back and did some  
11 calculations. We have seen approximately \$300 million  
12 has been spent on cleanup.

13 So we went back and did calculations, and we  
14 looked at how much went to the local community. It  
15 looks like less than 2 percent, way less than 2 percent.  
16 But we thought we would be nice. So we wanted you guys  
17 to take a look at it, come back. The figures that you  
18 are giving us is a current 2000 -- 2000, 2002, 2003,  
19 which is a damn size improvement.

20 But we are talking about historical  
21 information, because what it shows is a pattern, and we  
22 are trying to change those patterns. And we need your  
23 help and assistance in making sure these patterns stay  
24 changed.

25 In other words, that if you got 94124, it's the

1 community that has suffered because of the Shipyard in  
2 the past. There should be some benefit to the local  
3 community.

4 I think when you look at the write-ups and the  
5 transfer of the original transfer, it talks about local  
6 community. If you look at Superfund law, the local  
7 community, well, we need your help in assistance in  
8 changing some of the parameters so it benefits the local  
9 community.

10 MS. PENDERGRASS: Mr. Campbell, do you have  
11 a -- a direct question that you'd like or an action item  
12 to --

13 MR. CAMPBELL: Yeah.

14 MS. PENDERGRASS: -- follow with that?

15 MR. CAMPBELL: Well, I'm saying that the  
16 answer, the way it is, does not give the explicit number  
17 of how much has been spent on cleanup, how much has  
18 been --

19 MS. PENDERGRASS: So are you asking for more  
20 clarity --

21 MR. CAMPBELL: Yes.

22 MS. PENDERGRASS: -- on that question?

23 MR. CAMPBELL: Yes, specifically.

24 MS. PENDERGRASS: Thank you. And you're  
25 directing that to specifically . . . ?

1           MR. CAMPBELL: We've got Dave and Keith right  
2 there.

3           MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay. So --

4           MR. CAMPBELL: I think they understand the  
5 question.

6           MS. PENDERGRASS: All right. Well, I just want  
7 to make sure that we get that as a follow-up action item  
8 and that that happens at the next RAB that we do get out  
9 a written response to that with more clarity. Does that  
10 make sense? All right. Very fine.

11          MR. CAMPBELL: Thank you.

12          MS. PENDERGRASS: One more question, and then I  
13 really, if we can, if there's any other questions from  
14 the audience.

15          MS. PETERSON: Mine -- mine is quick. It's an  
16 addendum to Maurice's.

17                There is a first-choice hiring by the City and  
18 County of San Francisco. Would you see how that applies  
19 to the Shipyard also?

20          MS. PENDERGRASS: You want to add that on to  
21 your --

22          MS. PETERSON: Yes.

23          MS. PENDERGRASS: -- your question?

24          MS. PETERSON: If you don't have a copy of it,  
25 the City does have a copy of that, that law.

1 MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay. Do we have any other  
2 questions from the audience at this point?

3 MR. TOMPKINS: One --

4 MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay.

5 MR. TOMPKINS: I love you too -- as a follow-up  
6 to Maurice's dealing with econ.

7 MS. PENDERGRASS: Uh-huh.

8 MR. TOMPKINS: Would it be appropriate, then,  
9 that it be submitted to the Economics Committee if we're  
10 dealing with operate that it be in writing to the  
11 econ. committee and then to the general body as well?

12 MS. PENDERGRASS: Well, actually, the way the  
13 process was set up is: The questions are going direct.  
14 However, the --

15 MR. TOMPKINS: I understand.

16 MS. PENDERGRASS: -- the Navy was submitting  
17 those answers through the various committees. So -- the  
18 appropriate committee. So that's how. But those  
19 questions were coming direct.

20 MR. TOMPKINS: But then from the general body,  
21 that's the information will be made available for all of  
22 us?

23 MS. PENDERGRASS: Was going through the --  
24 exactly.

25 MR. MASON: Well, basically, that -- that

1 question was part of the economic question that we were  
2 asking --

3 MS. PENDERGRASS: Absolutely.

4 MR. MASON: -- you know. So, you know, Maurice  
5 just --

6 MS. PENDERGRASS: Sh. No sidebars.

7 MR. MASON: Maurice just explained it a  
8 little -- a little further in detail.

9 MS. PENDERGRASS: Very good.

10 MR. MASON: But I did bring it out in my report  
11 that I wanted to get on the record.

12 MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay. So I think we are  
13 clear about that question and -- and how that's been  
14 assigned.

15 Yes, sir. Final question.

16 MR. DA COSTA: I have a comment. My name is  
17 Francisco Da Costa.

18 I have requested the Navy when they had a  
19 meeting some time ago that I think one of the mitigation  
20 factors would be for the Navy to have the City and  
21 County of San Francisco, especially the Health  
22 Department and the State Department, so that we have  
23 some equipment to monitor the air so that we can  
24 neutralize and attend the adverse impacts of what  
25 happened in this area and has affected a lot of the

1 constituents in the 94124 area.

2           This is a mitigation factor, that the Navy  
3 should work with the City and County of San Francisco,  
4 especially the Health Department, the air quality area,  
5 in order to -- to help our children, because I've --  
6 I've heard some experts here give some of their data,  
7 but it's not linked to empirical data.

8           MS. PENDERGRASS: So what are asking for  
9 exactly, Mr. Da Costa?

10          MR. DA COSTA: What I'm asking for is for the  
11 Navy to work with the City so that we can address some  
12 mitigation factors, and I have already spoken to the  
13 Navy personnel before what exactly they are.

14          MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay. I appreciate that.  
15 But that question is too broad. At this point, we would  
16 need to -- you need to clarify that down in writing  
17 and -- so that we can submit it. We really are trying  
18 in this body to -- to address all the questions and  
19 concerns of the community, but we need to get that  
20 question a little bit more detailed so we can answer  
21 that.

22          MR. DA COSTA: Ma'am, whenever you have a  
23 mitigation factor, the Navy knows how much they can set  
24 aside for the community. Maurice asked it another way.

25          What I'm sa- -- In other words, I could ask



1 the Navy, could they give the city \$2 million? That  
2 would not be appropriate. But if I make a statement  
3 like this, knowing what has happened with our experts,  
4 including the radiological --

5 MS. PENDERGRASS: Yes.

6 MR. DA COSTA: -- sort of history and survey  
7 that was given --

8 MS. PENDERGRASS: Yes, sir.

9 MR. DA COSTA: -- this is the appropriate time  
10 for the Navy to show some good faith and -- and follow  
11 up with some mitigation factors.

12 MS. PENDERGRASS: I understand.

13 Is that clear?

14 MS. SUMCHAI: I did want to say something,  
15 Francisco, that kind of dovetails onto a point that --  
16 that you make is very important.

17 The -- the California Air Resources Board has  
18 agreed to work with Literacy for Environmental Justice  
19 to identify a site for the permanent stationing of an  
20 air monitor in the community, and that does serve as a  
21 source of hard data and to alert the community to bad  
22 air days. And conceivably, you know, the Navy and the  
23 City should be cooperating in that effort to identify  
24 the best site as well as to monitor the results of  
25 that -- that air monitor.

1 MS. PENDERGRASS: Thank you, Dr. Sumchai.  
2 One last question, and then this meeting will  
3 be adjourned.  
4 Yes, sir.  
5 MR. ATTENDEE: During the presentation by the  
6 Health Department, it was stated that we could ask  
7 questions directly of the Health Department. To whom do  
8 we address those? Is there address or . . . ?  
9 MS. BROWNELL: Yeah, and I'm getting -- you can  
10 direct them to me, and I can give you in e-mail.  
11 MS. PENDERGRASS: Okay. Excellent.  
12 Mr. Keichline?  
13 MR. KEICHLINE: Have we brought up any future  
14 agenda topics, or are there?  
15 MS. PENDERGRASS: Well, the future agenda --  
16 agenda topics are coming from -- through -- coming from  
17 this body through the Co-chair. So they should be  
18 arising through the subcommittee process alerted to --  
19 forwarded to Mr. Brown, and then Mr. Brown is adding  
20 those to the agenda.  
21 So that is the process, unless there's  
22 something that comes out of our general meeting that we  
23 want to put onto the agenda.  
24 Is there something that anyone would like to  
25 bring up that perhaps they have and funnel through a

1 subcommittee?

2 All right, then. This meeting is adjourned.

3 (Off record at 8:15 p.m., 1/23/03.)

4 ---oOo---

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I, CHRISTINE M. NICCOLI, Certified Shorthand Reporter of the State of California, do hereby certify that the foregoing meeting was reported by me stenographically to the best of my ability at the time and place aforementioned.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF I have hereunto set my hand  
this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_.

---

CHRISTINE M. NICCOLI, C.S.R. NO. 4569